



SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Certificate of Appropriateness Case Report

HEARING DATE: SEPTEMBER 6, 2017

CONTINUED FROM: JUNE 21, 2017

Filing Date: June 5, 2014
Case No.: **2012.1410A**
Project Address: **77-85 FEDERAL STREET**
Historic Landmark: South End Landmark District
Zoning: MUO (Mixed-Use Office) Zoning District
65-X Height and Bulk District
Block/Lot: 3774/444
Applicant: Adam Franch, Aralon Properties
482 Bryant Street
San Francisco, CA 94107
Staff Contact Natalia Kwiatkowska - (415) 575-9185
natalia.kwiatkowska@sfgov.org
Reviewed By Timothy Frye – (415) 575-6822
tim.frye@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

PROPERTY DESCRIPTION

77-85 FEDERAL STREET are two existing two-story, non-historic office buildings (measuring approximately 17,166 sq ft) located on a rectangular midblock through lot on the southeast side of Federal Street between De Boom and 2nd Streets. The lot has approximately 107 ft of frontage on Federal Street and 87 ft 6 in of frontage on De Boom Street. Originally constructed in 1940 and 1948, the existing industrial buildings were constructed outside of the district's period of significance and are a non-contributing resource within the South End Landmark District. Also located on the subject lot is a non-historic parking lot accessible from De Boom Street.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The proposed project entails the demolition of the two existing two-story office buildings and parking lot, and the new construction of a new, five-story with basement commercial building (approximately 72,471 sq ft). The proposed project would construct approximately 49,840 sq ft of office space, approximately 22,631 sq ft of retail space (gym), approximately 4,057 sq ft of usable open space via roof decks, twenty five (25) new off-street parking spaces, two (2) new service vehicle stalls (off-street loading spaces), one hundred twenty four (124) new Class 1 bicycle parking spaces, ten (10) Class 2 bicycle parking spaces, and new showers and lockers. The proposed project is organized into one large mass occupying the entire lot and separated by setbacks. On the exterior, the proposed project would feature industrial style aluminum-sash windows and cement material. The project would have frontage and entrances on Federal and De Boom Streets.

OTHER ACTIONS REQUIRED

Proposed work requires a Large Project Authorization and Office Allocation from the Planning Commission and a Building Permit from the Department of Building Inspection. The Planning Commission shall review the proposed project as part of an Office Allocation Authorization (Planning Code Section 321 and 322) and Large Project Authorization (Planning Code Section 329), since the project includes new construction of office space in excess of 25,000 gross square ft within the Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plan.

COMPLIANCE WITH THE PLANNING CODE PROVISIONS

The proposed project is in compliance with all other provisions of the Planning Code.

PUBLIC/NEIGHBORHOOD INPUT

To date, the Department has received approximately three public correspondences about the proposed project. The public correspondence expressed concern over increased traffic, overall scale and massing on a narrow street, and impact on the historic nature of the street and neighborhood. Concern in regards to increased traffic and overall scale and massing is addressed in the Planning Commission case report and Environmental Analysis. Concern in regards to impact of the proposed project on the historic nature of the street and neighborhood is addressed in this case report. Copies of this correspondence have been included within the Commissioner packets.

ISSUES & CONSIDERATIONS

- Environmental Review Appeal: The project was determined not to have a significant effect on the environment per the Draft Community Plan Preliminary Mitigated Negative Declaration (CP-PMND). The CP-PMND was appealed and upheld by the Planning Commission. The issuance of the Community Plan Final Mitigated Negative Declaration (CP-FMND) was approved by the Planning Commission on August 24, 2017.
- Large Project Authorization: The project requires a Large Project Authorization (LPA) from the Planning Commission, since the project includes construction of more than 25,000 gross square feet within the UMU Zoning District. The LPA is tentatively scheduled for review by the Planning Commission on September 14, 2017.
- Office Development Authorization: The project requires an Office Allocation (OFA) from the Planning Commission, since the project includes new construction of office space in excess of 25,000 gross square feet within the Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plan. The OFA is tentatively scheduled for review by the Planning Commission on September 14, 2017.
- Non-Contributing Resource: Per Appendix I of Article 10, 77-85 Federal Street is currently listed as a non-contributor to the South End Landmark District.
- Architectural Review Committee (ARC): On June 7, 2016, the Architectural Review Committee (ARC) of the Historic Preservation Commission reviewed the proposed project, and provided their recommendations in a letter dated June 15, 2016 (See Attached). The Project Sponsor

responded to the comments from the ARC, and revised their design by: replacing the proposed brick cladding with hard-troweled fine diamond cement finish and incorporating the primary façade materials along the entire length of the visible side facades; replacing the previously proposed corten steel pilaster base with an ogee detailed cement base; and refining the cornice on the primary and setback facades facing Federal and De Boom Streets.

APPLICABLE PRESERVATION STANDARDS

ARTICLE 10

Pursuant to Section 1006.2 of the Planning Code, unless exempt from the Certificate of Appropriateness requirements or delegated to Planning Department Preservation staff through the Administrative Certificate Appropriateness process, the Historic Preservation Commission is required to review any applications for the construction, alteration, removal, or demolition of any designated Landmark for which a City permit is required. Section 1006.6 states that in evaluating a request for a Certificate of Appropriateness for an individual landmark or a contributing building within a historic district, the Historic Preservation Commission must find that the proposed work is in compliance with the *Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties*, as well as the designating Ordinance and any applicable guidelines, local interpretations, bulletins, related appendices, or other policies.

ARTICLE 10 – Appendix I – South End Landmark District

In reviewing an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness, the Historic Preservation Commission must consider whether the proposed work would be compatible with the character of the South End Landmark District as described in Appendix I of Article 10 of the Planning Code and the character-defining features specifically outlined in the designating ordinance.

THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR'S STANDARDS

Rehabilitation is the act or process of making possible a compatible use for a property through repair, alterations, and additions while preserving those portions or features that convey its historical, cultural, or architectural values. The Rehabilitation Standards provide, in relevant part(s):

Standard 1: A property shall be used for its historic purpose or be placed in a new use that requires minimal change to the defining characteristics of the building and its site and environment.

The proposed project would provide new office use within the South End Landmark District. Office use is a compatible new use within the surrounding landmark district. Office use requires minimal change to the district's character-defining features, as evidenced by the numerous conversions of existing warehouses and light industrial properties into office space. Therefore, the proposed project complies with Rehabilitation Standard 1.

Standard 2: The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of historic materials or alteration of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided.

The proposed project would not remove or alter any features or spaces, which characterize the surrounding landmark district. The proposed project would maintain the historic character of the surrounding landmark district by providing for compatible new construction, which is consistent with the district's character-defining features, including, but not limited to, one-to-six-story mass and form, rhythmically-spaced, deeply recessed fenestration, and defined cornice, as well as other elements identified in the designating ordinance for the landmark. Therefore, the proposed project complies with Rehabilitation Standard 2.

- Standard 3:** Each property will be recognized as a physical record of its time, place and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or architectural elements from other buildings, shall not be undertaken.

The proposed project does not include the addition of conjectural elements or architectural features from other buildings. The new construction would not create a false sense of historical development and is designed to be contemporary in nature and compatible to the district. Therefore, the proposed project complies with Rehabilitation Standard 3.

- Standard 4:** Most properties change over time; those changes that have acquired historic significance in their own right shall be retained and preserved.

The proposed project does not involve alterations to the surrounding district, which have acquired significance in their own right. The existing buildings and parking lot are non-contributing elements within the South End Landmark District, and have not gained significance in their own right. Therefore, the proposed project complies with Rehabilitation Standard 4.

- Standard 5:** Distinctive features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of fine craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.

The proposed project does not impact or destroy any distinctive features, finishes or construction techniques, which characterize the surrounding district. The subject lot is currently occupied by two non-contributing two-story office buildings and parking lot, and does not contain any contributing features or historic materials associated with the surrounding landmark district. Therefore, the proposed project complies with Rehabilitation Standard 5.

- Standard 6:** Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacements of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture and other visual qualities and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence.

The proposed project does not include the repair or replacement of any historic features, since there are no historic features on the subject lot. Therefore, the proposed project complies with Rehabilitation Standard 6.

Standard 7: Chemical or physical treatments, such as sandblasting, that cause damage to historic materials shall not be used. The surface cleaning of structures, if appropriate, shall be undertaken using the gentlest means possible.

The proposed project does not involve chemical or physical treatments, since there are no historic features on the subject lot. Therefore, the proposed project complies with Rehabilitation Standard 7.

Standard 8: Significant archaeological resources affected by a project shall be protected and preserved. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures will be undertaken.

The proposed project does include some excavation work. This project was reviewed by Planning Department's staff archeologist on December 10, 2013 and was determined to have a low potential to disturb significant archeological resources. Accidental discovery protocols will be followed if archeological resources are encountered during project activities. Therefore, the proposed project complies with Rehabilitation Standard 8.

Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work will be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.

The proposed project would not destroy or damage any contributing elements to the South End Landmark District. The proposed project has been designed to be compatible with several elements of the landmark district, including the district's massing, form, scale, materials and features, yet is differentiated by the nature of the project's construction, use and detailing.

Overall, the proposed project offers a contemporary infill project within a district that appropriately draws from historic references in a contemporary manner. Therefore, the proposed project complies with Rehabilitation Standard #9.

Standard 10: New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.

The proposed project includes new construction, which would not affect the essential form and integrity of the landmark district, since the proposal does not impact any character-defining features of the surrounding district and offers compatible, yet contemporary, infill new construction. The project shall be undertaken in a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the district would be unimpaired. Therefore, the proposed project complies with Rehabilitation Standard 10.

Summary: The Department finds that the overall project is consistent with the *Secretary of the Interior Standards for Rehabilitation*.

STAFF ANALYSIS

Included as an exhibit are architectural drawings of the existing building and the proposed project. Based on the requirements of Article 10, Appendix I of Article 10 of the Planning Code, and the *Secretary of Interior's Standards*, Department staff has determined the following:

APPENDIX I OF ARTICLE 10

77-85 Federal Street are two non-contributing resource located within the South End Landmark District, as designated in Appendix I of Article 10 of the San Francisco Planning Code. The South End Landmark District is significant under events and design/construction for its strong collection of late nineteenth-century and early twentieth century masonry warehouses, which are representative of San Francisco's maritime, labor, industrial and railroad activities for the period of significance between 1867 and 1935. This district is also significant for the collection of well-known architects and businesses that arose along the southern waterfront, and for the intact collection of brick and reinforced concrete industrial warehouses.

Per Section 6 of Appendix I, the South End Landmark District is characterized by the following character-defining features:

1. *Overall Form and Continuity- Building height is generally within a six-story range, and many of the oldest structures are one or two stories in height.*
2. *Scale and Proportion - The buildings are of typical warehouse design, large in bulk, often with large arches and openings originally designed for easy vehicular access. There is a regularity of overall form. The earlier brick structures blend easily with the scaled-down Beaux Arts forms of the turn of the century and the plain reinforced concrete structures characteristic of twentieth-century industrial architecture.*
3. *Fenestration - The earliest structures have few windows, expressing their warehouse function. They are varied in size, rhythmically spaced, deeply recessed, produce a strong shadow line, and relate in shape and proportion to those in nearby buildings. Larger industrial sash windows began to be incorporated in structures built from the 1920s and onward. Door openings are often massive to facilitate easy access of bulk materials.*
4. *Materials - Standard brick masonry is predominant for the oldest buildings in the district, with reinforced concrete introduced after the 1906 fire, although its widespread use did not occur until the 1920s. Brick and stone paving treatments on Federal and First and De Boom Streets respectively are extant as well as Beltline Railroad Tracks which run throughout the District.*
5. *Color - Red brick is typical, with some yellow and painted brick. Muted earth tones predominate in shades of red, brown, green, gray and blue.*
6. *Texture - Typical facing materials give a rough textured appearance. The overall texture of the facades is rough grained.*

7. *Detail - Arches are common at the ground floor, and are frequently repeated on upper floors. Flattened arches for window treatment are typical. Cornices are simple and generally tend to be abstract versions of the more elaborate cornices found in downtown commercial structures from the nineteenth century. Most of the surfaces of the later buildings are plain and simple reflecting their function. Some of the earlier brick work contains suggestions of pilasters, again highly abstracted. Where detail occurs, it is often found surrounding entryways.*

The South End Landmark District outlines standards for new construction and alterations within the South End Landmark District, including standards for façade line continuity, fenestration, and infill new construction (See Appendix). As noted within Section 7 of Appendix I, “new construction on vacant sites should conform to the general profile of the District, especially as to scale, sculptural qualities of facade and entrance detailing, fenestration patterns and materials described in Section 6 of this ordinance.” The proposed project appears to be compatible and in general conformity with the historic character and character-defining features of the South End Landmark District, as outlined within Appendix I of Article 10 of the San Francisco Planning Code, and as follows:

Overall Form and Continuity

77-85 Federal Street appears to be consistent and compatible with the overall height and form of the South End Landmark District. The proposed project is five stories tall along the Federal and De Boom Street facades, thus relating to the district’s typical building heights, which range from one- to six-stories tall. The Architectural Review Committee of the Historic Preservation Commission recommended the primary façade materials be incorporated and continued along the entire length of the visible side facades due to the visibility of side (secondary) facades. The Project Sponsor has revised the original proposal, which included a brick façade with metal siding that terminated partway along the side elevations, and incorporated the primary cement material along the entire length of all facades. The Department finds that the proposed cement material continued onto the side elevations allows for a reading of building in the round, as occurs within other buildings in the landmark district.

Scale and Proportion

77-85 Federal Street appears to be consistent and compatible with the overall scale and proportion of the South End Landmark District with its large rectangular bulk and form, vertical bay articulation and sense of regularity. Like other contributing resources, the proposed project has full lot coverage, which is consistent with historic warehouse design. The proposed project features setback at the upper floors, which are driven by Planning Code requirements, which only allows for a two-story massing at the street face along Federal Street; however, the massing, as required by the Code, is consistent with the features of the district. Along De Boom Street, the project is three-story tall along the street frontage with a setback incorporated for the upper two floors. This De Boom Street massing allows for a strong relationship to the two adjacent buildings, which are two-stories in scale. Along Federal Street, the project is two stories tall along the street frontage with a setback incorporated at the third floor and fourth/fifth floor levels. This massing along Federal Street allows for an appropriate relationship to the neighboring three-story building. Overall, the proposed project articulates the street facades into a base, shaft and capital arrangement, as is consistent with the façade composition found within many of the district’s contributing resources.

Fenestration

77-85 Federal Street appears to be consistent and compatible with the district's fenestration pattern and door openings, as evidenced by the project's deeply recessed windows, which are rhythmically-spaced on the Federal and De Boom Street facades. These windows and the surrounding sills create strong shadow lines along the street facades, and align to the fenestration on the adjacent contributing resources. On the lower three floors, the project incorporates an appropriate proportion of deeply recessed industrial sash windows in a regular pattern on both street facades. On the upper floors, the project incorporates a more contemporary expression with large panes of glazing with vertical aluminum sash divisions that align with the industrial sash divisions at lower floors. At the ground floor level of the Federal Street façade, the main entry doors are setback from the street edge and echo the large-scale door openings found within the district's warehouses, albeit in a more contemporary architectural vocabulary. Similarly, along De Boom Street, the garage entry door is scaled to accommodate off-street parking, which is a characteristic common among the district's warehouse properties. The Architectural Review Committee of the Historic Preservation Commission recommended the project incorporate a projecting header, sill or frame to better define the exterior fenestration. The Project Sponsor has revised the original proposal to incorporate a projecting sill to add additional depth on the exterior facade. The Department finds that the proposed fenestration with the projecting sill to be consistent and compatible with the district's fenestration pattern and recess.

Materials

77-85 Federal Street appears to be consistent and compatible with the district's material palette through the incorporation of cement material and aluminum-sash window system. Reinforced concrete is a dominant material found within the surrounding district. The aluminum-sash system is designed and configured to relate to the district's regularized fenestration pattern. The usage of a compatible (yet differentiated) material allows for the proposed project's contemporary expression within the South End Landmark District. To ensure that the material is consistent with the surrounding landmark district, Department staff has included a condition of approval to review materials samples, which demonstrates the range of color, finish and texture of the cladding. The Architectural Review Committee of the Historic Preservation Commission recommended refinement of the previously proposed metal panels across the entire length of the fourth and fifth floors and stated that the ARC would be open to an alternate exterior material palette. The Project Sponsor has revised the proposal to incorporate a dark gray cement material on all facades of the building. The Department finds that the proposed dark gray cement material allows for a reading of building in the round.

Color

77-85 Federal Street appears to be consistent with the colors found within the surrounding landmark district, as evidenced by the dark gray cement. To ensure that the color is consistent with the surrounding landmark district, Department staff has included a condition of approval to review a color sample, which demonstrates the range of color, finish and texture of the cladding. The Architectural Review Committee of the Historic Preservation Commission recommended that any proposed exterior brick should have a strong texture and color variation. The Project Sponsor has revised the project to incorporate a dark gray cement material for the entire building, eliminating the previously proposed buff-colored brick. The Department finds that the proposed dark gray cement material is consistent and compatible with the district's color palette since the immediate area.

Texture

77-85 Federal Street features a smooth cement finish, which is consistent with the district's reinforced concrete elements, which often feature a smooth finish. To ensure consistency with the finish and color of the surrounding landmark district, Department staff has included a condition of approval to review a material sample of the proposed cladding. The Architectural Review Committee of the Historic Preservation Commission recommended that any proposed material should have a strong texture and color variation. The Project Sponsor has revised the project to incorporate a hard-troweled fine diamond cement finish. The Department finds that the proposed cement texture and finish is compatible with the district's reinforced concrete elements, which often feature a smooth finish.

Details

77-85 Federal Street is located in a mixed character area of the landmark district with examples of older brick warehouses with deeply recessed openings and newer reinforced concrete warehouses with steel-sash windows. The proposed project addresses the character of this area by directly referencing the adjacent historic resources, and by incorporating similar design elements, including simple cornices, recessed fenestration, and a vertical façade orientation. The project features a regularized façade pattern with large bays of glazing separated by pilasters emphasizing vertical orientation. Each massing is capped by a simple cornice, including the setback massing to better illustrate a relationship between the several masses of the project. In addition, the project provides for an eight-inch setback between aluminum-sash windows and the cement material, thus providing for a deep shadow line along the street façade.

The proposed project is consistent and compatible with the district's details, as evidenced by the proposed project's façade organization and cornice articulation, which reference characteristics found within the South End Landmark District. The proposed project draws from the district's typical warehouse façade design, as evidenced by the façade composition of base, shaft and cornice and larger-scale vehicular opening. The façade organization references the organizational scheme of the later warehouses within the district, while still evoking the pilaster elements found within some of the district's earlier brick warehouses. As is common within surrounding district, the entryways feature additional detailing, including brick surrounds, smaller canopies and signage. The proposed project references the entryway details by providing for a simple projecting canopy along the recessed main pedestrian entrances along De Boom and Federal Streets and along the off-street parking entry along De Boom Street, which denotes the project's main entryways. The Architectural Review Committee of the Historic Preservation Commission recommended an addition of a secondary roofline/cap along Federal Street and refinement of the previously proposed corten steel base along De Boom Street. The Project Sponsor has revised the project to incorporate a cornice on the setback massing facing Federal and De Boom Streets and has replaced the previously proposed corten steel pilaster base with an ogee detailed cement base. The Department finds that the proposed secondary cornices are compatible and consistent with the district since a roofline termination is a commonly found feature along the street facades and the proposed cement base to be compatible with the materials found in the district.

Summary

The proposed project appears to respect the general size, shape, scale and historic character of the character-defining features and contributing resources within the South End Landmark District. The proposed project provides a contemporary expression that appropriately references important elements and characteristics of the district. Therefore, the proposed project appears to comply with the standards for infill new construction, as outlined in Appendix I of Article 10 of the San Francisco Planning Code.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW STATUS

Pursuant to the Guidelines of the State Secretary of Resources for the implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), on August 24, 2017, the Planning Commission of the City and County of San Francisco determined that the proposed project would not have a significant effect on the environment. This finding is based upon the criteria of the Guidelines of the State Secretary for Resources, Sections 15064 (Determining Significant Effect), 15065 (Mandatory Findings of Significance), 15070 (Decision to prepare a Negative Declaration), and 15183 (Projects Consistent with a Community Plan or Zoning). The Project is consistent with the adopted zoning controls in the Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plan and was encompassed within the analysis contained in the Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plan Final EIR. Since the Final EIR was finalized, there have been no substantial changes to the Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plan and no substantial changes in circumstances that would require major revisions to the Final EIR due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or an increase in the severity of previously identified significant impacts, and there is no new information of substantial importance that would change the conclusions set forth in the Final EIR.

PLANNING DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION

Planning Department staff recommends APPROVAL WITH CONDITIONS of the proposed project as it appears to meet the *Secretary of the Interior Standards for Rehabilitation* and requirements of Article 10.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

To ensure that the proposed work is undertaken in conformance with this Certificate of Appropriateness, staff recommends the following conditions:

1. As part of the Building Permit, the Project Sponsor shall provide material samples to ensure compatibility with the surrounding landmark district. These material samples shall demonstrate the range of color and finishes for the identified materials.
2. As part of the Building Permit, the Project Sponsor shall provide additional detail (dimensions, profiles and materials) and a sample of the proposed storefront and window systems to ensure compatibility with the surrounding landmark district. The proposed storefront system shall feature a powder-coated or painted finish, as is characteristic of the surrounding landmark district.

ATTACHMENTS

Draft Motion

Exhibits:

- Parcel Map
- Sanborn Map
- Zoning Map
- Height & Bulk Map
- Aerial Photographs
- Site Photos

Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP)

Letter to Mitchell Benjamin from ARC, dated June 15, 2016

Public Correspondence

Project Sponsor submittal, including:

- Site Photographs
- Reduced Plans



SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Historic Preservation Commission Draft Motion

HEARING DATE: SEPTEMBER 6, 2017
CONTINUED FROM: JUNE 21, 2017

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

Reception:
415.558.6378

Fax:
415.558.6409

Planning
Information:
415.558.6377

Filing Date: June 5, 2014
Case No.: **2012.1410A**
Project Address: **77-85 FEDERAL STREET**
Historic Landmark: South End Landmark District
Zoning: MUO (Mixed-Use Office) Zoning District
65-X Height and Bulk District
Block/Lot: 3774/444
Applicant: Adam Franch, Aralon Properties
482 Bryant Street
San Francisco, CA 94107
Staff Contact Natalia Kwiatkowska - (415) 575-9185
natalia.kwiatkowska@sfgov.org
Reviewed By Timothy Frye – (415) 575-6822
tim.frye@sfgov.org

ADOPTING FINDINGS FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS FOR PROPOSED WORK DETERMINED TO BE APPROPRIATE FOR AND CONSISTENT WITH THE PURPOSES OF ARTICLE 10, TO MEET THE STANDARDS OF ARTICLE 10 AND TO MEET THE SECRETARY OF INTERIOR'S STANDARDS FOR REHABILITATION, FOR THE PROPERTY LOCATED ON LOT 444 IN ASSESSOR'S BLOCK 3774, WITHIN THE SOUTH END LANDMARK DISTRICT, MUO (MIXED-USE OFFICE) ZONING DISTRICT AND 65-X HEIGHT AND BULK DISTRICT.

PREAMBLE

WHEREAS, on June 5, 2014, Adam Franch of Aralon Properties (Property Owners), filed an application with the San Francisco Planning Department (Department) for a Certificate of Appropriateness for new construction of a five-story commercial building located on Lot 444 in Assessor's Block 3774.

WHEREAS, on May 31, 2017, Draft Community Plan Preliminary Mitigated Negative Declaration (CP-PMND) for the Project was prepared and published for public review; and

WHEREAS, the Draft CP-PMND was available for public comment until June 20, 2017; and

WHEREAS, on June 20, 2017, an appeal of the Community Plan Mitigated Negative Declaration was filed with the Department.

WHEREAS, on August 24, 2017, the Commission conducted a duly noticed public hearing at a regularly scheduled meeting on the Appeal of the Community Plan Mitigated Negative Declaration, 2012.1410E.

WHEREAS, on August 24, 2017, the Commission upheld the CP-PMND and approved the issuance of the Community Plan Final Mitigated Negative Declaration (CP-FMND) as prepared by the Planning Department in compliance with CEQA, the state CEQA Guidelines and Chapter 31.

WHEREAS, on August 24, 2017, the Planning Department/Planning Commission reviewed and considered the Community Plan Final Mitigated Negative Declaration (CP-FMND) and found that the contents of said report and the procedures through which the CP-FMND was prepared, publicized, and reviewed complies with the California Environmental Quality Act (California Public Resources Code Sections 21000 et seq.) (CEQA), Title 14 California Code of Regulations Sections 15000 et seq. (the "CEQA Guidelines") and Chapter 31 of the San Francisco Administrative Code ("Chapter 31"); and

WHEREAS, the Planning Department/Planning Commission found the CP-FMND was adequate, accurate and objective, reflected the independent analysis and judgment of the Department of City Planning and the Planning Commission, and approved the FMND for the Project in compliance with CEQA, the CEQA Guidelines and Chapter 31.

The Planning Department Commission Secretary is the custodian of records; the file for Case No. 2012.1410E is located at 1650 Mission Street, Fourth Floor, San Francisco, California.

Planning Department staff prepared a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting program (MMRP), which material was made available to the public and this Commission for this Commission's review.

WHEREAS, on September 6, 2017, the Commission conducted a duly noticed public hearing on the current project, Case No. 2012.1410A (Project) for its appropriateness.

WHEREAS, in reviewing the Application, the Commission has had available for its review and consideration case reports, plans, and other materials pertaining to the Project contained in the Department's case files, has reviewed and heard testimony and received materials from interested parties during the public hearing on the Project.

MOVED, that the Commission hereby grants with conditions a Certificate of Appropriateness, in conformance with the architectural plans dated June 8, 2017 and labeled Exhibit A in the docket for Case No. 2012.1410A based on the following findings:

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

To ensure that the proposed work is undertaken in conformance with this Certificate of Appropriateness, staff recommends the following conditions:

1. As part of the Building Permit, the Project Sponsor shall provide material samples to ensure compatibility with the surrounding landmark district. These material samples shall demonstrate the range of color and finishes for the identified materials.

2. As part of the Building Permit, the Project Sponsor shall provide additional detail (dimensions, profiles and materials) and a sample of the proposed storefront system to ensure compatibility with the surrounding landmark district. The proposed storefront system shall feature a powder-coated or painted finish, as is characteristic of the surrounding landmark district.

FINDINGS

Having reviewed all the materials identified in the recitals above and having heard oral testimony and arguments, this Commission finds, concludes, and determines as follows:

1. The above recitals are accurate and also constitute findings of the Commission.
2. Findings pursuant to Article 10:

The Historical Preservation Commission has determined that the proposed work is compatible with the character of the South End Landmark District as described in Appendix I of Article 10 of the Planning Code.

- That the proposed project is compatible infill new construction within the South End Landmark District.
- That the proposed project does not destroy or damage historic materials or character-defining features of the South End Landmark District.
- That the essential form and integrity of the landmark and its environment would be unimpaired if the alterations were removed at a future date.
- That the proposal respects the character-defining features of South End Landmark District.
- The proposed project meets the requirements of Article 10.
- The proposed project meets the *Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation*, including:

Standard 9.

New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work will be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.

Standard 10:

New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.

3. **General Plan Compliance.** The proposed Certificate of Appropriateness is, on balance, consistent with the following Objectives and Policies of the General Plan:

I. URBAN DESIGN ELEMENT

THE URBAN DESIGN ELEMENT CONCERNS THE PHYSICAL CHARACTER AND ORDER OF THE CITY, AND THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PEOPLE AND THEIR ENVIRONMENT.

GOALS

The Urban Design Element is concerned both with development and with preservation. It is a concerted effort to recognize the positive attributes of the city, to enhance and conserve those attributes, and to improve the living environment where it is less than satisfactory. The Plan is a definition of quality, a definition based upon human needs.

OBJECTIVE 1

EMPHASIS OF THE CHARACTERISTIC PATTERN WHICH GIVES TO THE CITY AND ITS NEIGHBORHOODS AN IMAGE, A SENSE OF PURPOSE, AND A MEANS OF ORIENTATION.

POLICY 1.3

Recognize that buildings, when seen together, produce a total effect that characterizes the city and its districts.

OBJECTIVE 2

CONSERVATION OF RESOURCES WHICH PROVIDE A SENSE OF NATURE, CONTINUITY WITH THE PAST, AND FREEDOM FROM OVERCROWDING.

POLICY 2.4

Preserve notable landmarks and areas of historic, architectural or aesthetic value, and promote the preservation of other buildings and features that provide continuity with past development.

POLICY 2.5

Use care in remodeling of older buildings, in order to enhance rather than weaken the original character of such buildings.

POLICY 2.7

Recognize and protect outstanding and unique areas that contribute in an extraordinary degree to San Francisco's visual form and character.

The goal of a Certificate of Appropriateness is to provide additional oversight for buildings and districts that are architecturally or culturally significant to the City in order to protect the qualities that are associated with that significance.

The proposed project qualifies for a Certificate of Appropriateness and therefore furthers these policies and objectives by maintaining and preserving the character-defining features of the South End Landmark District for the future enjoyment and education of San Francisco residents and visitors.

4. The proposed project is generally consistent with the eight General Plan priority policies set forth in Section 101.1 in that:

- A) The existing neighborhood-serving retail uses will be preserved and enhanced and future opportunities for resident employment in and ownership of such businesses will be enhanced:

The project will not have any impact on any existing neighborhood serving retail uses. The project includes a new retail use (gym). The project will accommodate more employees in the area, who will likely patronize and strengthen existing retail uses within the immediate vicinity.

- B) The existing housing and neighborhood character will be conserved and protected in order to preserve the cultural and economic diversity of our neighborhoods:

The proposed project would not impact any existing housing, and will strengthen neighborhood character by respecting the character-defining features of South End Landmark District in conformance with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation.

- C) The City's supply of affordable housing will be preserved and enhanced:

The project will have no impact to housing supply.

- D) The commuter traffic will not impede MUNI transit service or overburden our streets or neighborhood parking:

The proposed project will not result in commuter traffic impeding MUNI transit service or overburdening the streets or neighborhood parking. The proposed project is located within a transit-rich neighborhood with walkable access to bus, light rail and train lines.

- E) A diverse economic base will be maintained by protecting our industrial and service sectors from displacement due to commercial office development. And future opportunities for resident employment and ownership in these sectors will be enhanced:

The proposed will not have any impact on industrial and service sector jobs, and will in fact enhance the opportunity for resident employment with the new ground-floor retail.

- F) The City will achieve the greatest possible preparedness to protect against injury and loss of life in an earthquake.

Preparedness against injury and loss of life in an earthquake is unaffected by the proposed work. Any construction or alteration associated with the project will be executed in compliance with all applicable construction and safety measures.

- G) That landmark and historic buildings will be preserved:

The project as proposed is in conformance with Article 10 of the Planning Code and the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation.

- H) Parks and open space and their access to sunlight and vistas will be protected from development:

The proposed project will not impact the access to sunlight or vistas for parks and open space.

5. For these reasons, the proposal overall, is appropriate for and consistent with the purposes of Article 10, meets the standards of Article 10, and the *Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation*, General Plan and Prop M findings of the Planning Code.

DECISION

That based upon the Record, the submissions by the Applicant, the staff of the Department and other interested parties, the oral testimony presented to this Commission at the public hearings, and all other written materials submitted by all parties, the Commission hereby **GRANTS WITH CONDITIONS a Certificate of Appropriateness** for the property located at Lot 444 in Assessor's Block 3774 for proposed work in conformance with the architectural plans dated June 8, 2017, labeled Exhibit A on file in the docket for Case No. 2012.1410A.

APPEAL AND EFFECTIVE DATE OF MOTION: The Commission's decision on a Certificate of Appropriateness shall be final unless appealed within thirty (30) days. Any appeal shall be made to the Board of Appeals, unless the proposed project requires Board of Supervisors approval or is appealed to the Board of Supervisors, such as a conditional use, in which case any appeal shall be made to the Board of Supervisors (see Charter Section 4.135).

Duration of this Certificate of Appropriateness: This Certificate of Appropriateness is issued pursuant to Article 10 of the Planning Code and is valid for a period of three (3) years from the effective date of approval by the Historic Preservation Commission. The authorization and right vested by virtue of this action shall be deemed void and canceled if, within 3 years of the date of this Motion, a site permit or building permit for the Project has not been secured by Project Sponsor.

THIS IS NOT A PERMIT TO COMMENCE ANY WORK OR CHANGE OF OCCUPANCY UNLESS NO BUILDING PERMIT IS REQUIRED. PERMITS FROM THE DEPARTMENT OF BUILDING INSPECTION (and any other appropriate agencies) MUST BE SECURED BEFORE WORK IS STARTED OR OCCUPANCY IS CHANGED.

I hereby certify that the Historic Preservation Commission ADOPTED the foregoing Motion on September 6, 2017.

Jonas P. Ionin
Commission Secretary

AYES:

NAYS:

ABSENT:


ADOPTED: September 6, 2017

SUBJECT PROPERTY



SAN FRANCISCO
PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Sanborn Map*




*The Sanborn Maps in San Francisco have not been updated since 1998, and this map may not accurately reflect existing conditions.

SUBJECT PROPERTY




Certificate of Appropriateness Hearing
Case Number 2012.1410ABX
77-85 Federal Street
Block 3774 Lot 444


Zoning Map



Height & Bulk Map



Aerial Photo



SUBJECT PROPERTY



Certificate of Appropriateness Hearing
Case Number 2012.1410ABX
77-85 Federal Street
Block 3774 Lot 444

Site Photo

SUBJECT PROPERTY




77-85 Federal Street, View along De Boom Street

Certificate of Appropriateness Hearing
Case Number 2012.1410ABX
77-85 Federal Street
Block 3774 Lot 444

Site Photo

SUBJECT PROPERTY



77-85 Federal Street, View along De Boom Street from 2nd St

Certificate of Appropriateness Hearing
Case Number 2012.1410ABX
77-85 Federal Street
Block 3774 Lot 444

Site Photo

SUBJECT PROPERTY



77-85 Federal Street, Existing Buildings along Federal St

Certificate of Appropriateness Hearing
Case Number 2012.1410ABX
77-85 Federal Street
Block 3774 Lot 444

Site Photo

SUBJECT PROPERTY



77-85 Federal Street, Existing Buildings along Federal St

Certificate of Appropriateness Hearing
Case Number 2012.1410ABX
77-85 Federal Street
Block 3774 Lot 444

EXHIBIT ____:

MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

(Including the Text of the Mitigation Measures Adopted as Conditions of Approval and Proposed Improvement Measures)

Mitigation Measure	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Schedule
Cultural Resources				
<p>Project Mitigation Measure 1: Construction Monitoring Program to Protect Adjacent Historical Resources. The project sponsor shall undertake a monitoring program to minimize damage to adjacent historic buildings. The monitoring program shall include the following components at a minimum:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Prior to the start of any ground-disturbing activity, the project sponsor shall engage a preservation consultant who is a historic architect or qualified historic preservation professional to undertake a pre-construction survey of 533, 543-545, and 563 2nd Street and, if necessary, 355 Bryant Street and photograph the preconstruction conditions of these buildings. Prior to the start of any ground-disturbing activity, the project sponsor shall engage a qualified vibration consultant who shall identify feasible means to avoid damage to 533, 543-545, and 563 2nd Street. If the vibration consultant deems it necessary, such measures will also be applied to 355 Bryant Street. Such methods may include using construction techniques that reduce vibration, using appropriate excavation shoring methods to prevent movement of adjacent structures, and providing adequate security to minimize risks of vandalism and fire. Based on the construction activities and equipment to be used and condition of the adjacent resources, the vibration consultant shall also establish a maximum vibration level that shall not be exceeded at each building, based on the building's existing condition, character-defining features, soils conditions, and anticipated construction practices (a common standard is 0.2 inch per second, peak particle velocity or PPV). <p>The project sponsor shall incorporate the vibration consultant's recommendations into construction specifications for the proposed project.</p>	Project sponsor, preservation consultant, vibration consultant, and contractor.	Prior to issuance of building permit.	Planning Department Preservation Technical Specialist and Environmental Review Officer (ERO).	Considered complete upon submittal to Planning Department of construction monitoring program.

Mitigation Measure	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Schedule
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To ensure that vibration levels do not exceed the established standard, the vibration consultant shall monitor ground-disturbing construction activities to ensure that damage to adjacent structures does not occur. Should the potential for damage to occur be observed, construction activities shall be halted and alternative construction techniques put in place (for example, use of smaller or lighter equipment). The vibration consultant shall prepare a final report that includes documentation of the pre-construction and post-construction conditions of these buildings and any methods employed during construction to reduce vibration levels to below the established standard. 				<p>Considered complete upon submittal to Planning Department of post-construction report on construction monitoring program.</p>
<p>Project Mitigation Measure 2: Archeological Accidental Discovery (PEIR Mitigation Measure J-2). The following mitigation measure is required to avoid any potential adverse effect from the proposed project on accidentally discovered buried or submerged historical resources as defined in CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(a) and (c). The project sponsor shall distribute the Planning Department archeological resource “ALERT” sheet to the project prime contractor; to any project subcontractor (including demolition, excavation, grading, foundation, etc. firms); or utilities firm involved in soils-disturbing activities within the project site. Prior to any soils-disturbing activities being undertaken, each contractor is responsible for ensuring that the “ALERT” sheet is circulated to all field personnel, including machine operators, field crew, supervisory personnel, etc. The project sponsor shall provide the Environmental Review Officer (ERO) with a signed affidavit from the responsible parties (prime contractor, subcontractor(s), and utilities firm) to the ERO confirming that all field personnel have received copies of the Alert Sheet.</p> <p>Should any indication of an archeological resource be encountered during any soils-disturbing activity of the project, the project Head Foreman and/or project sponsor shall immediately notify the ERO and shall immediately suspend any soils-disturbing activities in the vicinity of the discovery until the ERO has determined what additional measures should be undertaken.</p> <p>If the ERO determines that an archeological resource may be present within the project site, the project sponsor shall retain the services of an archeological consultant from the pool of qualified archeological</p>	<p>Project sponsor/project archeologist</p>	<p>Upon discovery of a buried historical resource</p>	<p>Project sponsor and Environmental Review Officer (ERO)</p>	<p>Upon determination by the ERO that a resource is not present, the project doesn't adversely impact an archeological resource, or upon certification of a final archeological resources report.</p>

Mitigation Measure	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/Reporting Responsibility	Monitoring Schedule
<p>consultants maintained by the Planning Department archeologist. The archeological consultant shall advise the ERO as to whether the discovery is an archeological resource, retains sufficient integrity, and is of potential scientific/historical/cultural significance. If an archeological resource is present, the archeological consultant shall identify and evaluate the archeological resource. The archeological consultant shall make a recommendation as to what action, if any, is warranted. Based on this information, the ERO may require, if warranted, specific additional measures to be implemented by the project sponsor.</p> <p>Measures might include: preservation in situ of the archeological resource; an archeological monitoring program; or an archeological testing program. If an archeological monitoring program or archeological testing program is required, it shall be consistent with the Environmental Planning Division guidelines for such programs. The ERO may also require that the project sponsor immediately implement a site security program if the archeological resource is at risk from vandalism, looting, or other damaging actions.</p> <p>The project archeological consultant shall submit a Final Archeological Resources Report (FARR) to the ERO that evaluates the historical significance of any discovered archeological resource and describing the archeological and historical research methods employed in the archeological monitoring/data recovery program(s) undertaken. Information that may put at risk any archeological resource shall be provided in a separate removable insert within the final report.</p> <p>Copies of the Draft FARR shall be sent to the ERO for review and approval. Once approved by the ERO, copies of the FARR shall be distributed as follows: California Archaeological Site Survey Northwest Information Center (NWIC) shall receive one (1) copy, and the ERO shall receive a copy of the transmittal of the FARR to the NWIC. The Environmental Planning Division of the Planning Department shall receive one bound copy, one unbound copy and one unlocked, searchable PDF copy on CD of the FARR along with copies of any formal site recordation forms (CA DPR 523 series) and/or documentation for nomination to the National Register of Historic Places/California Register of Historical Resources. In instances of high public interest or interpretive value, the ERO may require a different final report content, format, and distribution than that presented above.</p>				

Noise				
<p>Project Mitigation Measure 3: Construction Noise (PEIR Mitigation Measure F-2). The project sponsor shall develop a set of site-specific noise attenuation measures under the supervision of a qualified acoustical consultant. Prior to commencing construction, a plan for such measures shall be submitted to the Department of Building Inspection (DBI) to ensure that maximum feasible noise attenuation will be achieved. These attenuation measures shall include as many of the following control strategies as feasible:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Erect temporary plywood noise barriers around a construction site, particularly where a site adjoins noise-sensitive uses; • Utilize noise control blankets on a building structure as the building is erected to reduce noise emission from the site; • Evaluate the feasibility of noise control at the receivers by temporarily improving the noise reduction capability of adjacent buildings housing sensitive uses; • Monitor the effectiveness of noise attenuation measures by taking noise measurements; and • Post signs on-site pertaining to permitted construction days and hours and complaint procedures and who to notify in the event of a problem, with telephone numbers listed. 	Project sponsor and contractor	During construction	Project sponsor to provide Planning Department with monthly reports during construction period.	Considered complete upon receipt of final monitoring report at completion of construction.
Hazards and Hazardous Materials				
<p>Project Mitigation Measure 4: Hazardous Building Materials (PEIR Mitigation Measure L-1)</p> <p>The project sponsor shall ensure that any equipment containing polychlorinated biphenyls (PCB)s or di (2 ethylhexyl) phthalate (DEPH), such as fluorescent light ballasts, are removed and properly disposed of according to applicable federal, state, and local laws prior to the start of renovation, and that any fluorescent light tubes, which could contain mercury, are similarly removed and properly disposed of. Any other hazardous materials identified, either before or during work, shall be abated according to applicable federal, state, and local laws.</p>	Project sponsor or contractor	Prior to approval, through the site mitigation plan.	Planning Department, in consultation with the Department of Public Health (DPH).	Considered complete upon project sponsor's submittal of a monitoring report to DPH, with a copy to Planning Department and DBI, at end of construction..

This page intentionally left blank



SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

MEMO

DATE: June 15, 2016

TO: Mitchell Benjamin, Sternberg Benjamin Architects

FROM: Rich Sucre, Historic Preservation Technical Specialist,
(415) 575-9108

REVIEWED BY: Architectural Review Committee of the Historic Preservation
Commission

RE: **Meeting Notes - Review and Comment at the June 15, 2016
ARC-HPC Hearing for 77-85 Federal Street
Case No. 2012.1410A**

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

Reception:
415.558.6378

Fax:
415.558.6409

Planning
Information:
415.558.6377

At the request of the Planning Department, the Architectural Review Committee (ARC) was asked to review and comment on the proposed project at 77-85 Federal Street, which involves infill new construction within the South End Landmark District.

Currently, the proposed project is undergoing environmental review pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

ARC RECOMMENDATIONS/COMMENTS

Compatibility of New Construction with South End Landmark District

The ARC finds that the new construction is largely compatible with the South End Landmark District with the incorporation of the modifications as detailed below.

Recommendations on Overall Form & Continuity, Scale & Proportion

The ARC concurs with the staff determination that the proposed form, scale and proportion are consistent and compatible with the surrounding landmark district. The proposed project is five-stories tall, large in bulk with minimal setbacks, and provides for an appropriate massing and scale relative to the adjacent context and larger landmark district. Along De Boom Street, the project is three-story tall along the street frontage with a setback incorporated for the upper two floors. This massing allows for a strong relationship to the two adjacent buildings, which are two-stories in scale. Along Federal Street, the project is two stories tall along the street frontage with a setback incorporated at the third floor and fourth/fifth floor levels. This massing is driven by Planning Code requirements. The ARC finds that a taller building at the street frontage would be appropriate given the district's context and massing; however, Planning Code requirements only allow for the two-story massing at the street face along Federal Street. This massing along Federal Street allows for an appropriate relationship to the neighboring three-story building.

The ARC concurs with the staff recommendation regarding the material expression on the side (secondary) facades. Given the visibility of this façade, the Project should incorporate the primary

façade materials along the entire length of the visible side facades. Currently, the brick façade and metal siding terminate partway along the side elevations, and the side elevations express a simpler material palette (stucco or exposed concrete). To allow for a reading of building in the round, as occurs within other buildings in the landmark district, the ARC recommends continuing the primary façade material along the entire length of the visible side facades.

Concurrence on Fenestration

The ARC concurs with the staff recommendation and finds the proposed fenestration to be compatible with the surrounding landmark district. On the three lower floors, the project incorporates an appropriate proportion of deeply recessed industrial sash windows in a regular pattern on both street facades. On the upper floors, the project incorporates a butt-glazed window system with no visible frames or sashes.

If the project uses a brick material palette, the ARC recommended a refinement to the proposed fenestration to incorporate a projecting header, sill or frame to better define the exterior fenestration.

Recommendations for Materials, Color & Texture

The ARC concurs with the staff recommendation, and does not find the proposed metal panels to be compatible with the surrounding landmark district. Currently, the Project includes patterned metal panel across the entire length of the façade on the fourth and fifth floors. Although contemporary, the metal siding is too flat with no texture or visual depth. The Project Sponsor will need to select an alternate exterior material.

The ARC finds the proposed buff-colored brick to be compatible with the surrounding landmark district. Although red brick is a dominant material in the landmark district, the immediate area does not possess many examples of red brick. The project proposes a material palette consisting of a smooth-face, beige brick (first through third floors). The beige brick would be laid in a common bond pattern and would feature soldier course accents at the roofline. The ARC recommended that any proposed exterior brick should have a strong texture and color variation.

The ARC is open to an alternate exterior material palette. The Project Sponsor expressed a desire to eliminate the brick material on the exterior and redesign the façade in concrete or cement plaster. If one of these new materials is used on the exterior, the Project Sponsor should pay special attention to the texture and color of the concrete and/or cement plaster.

Recommendations for Details

The ARC concurs with the staff recommendation and does not find the proposed corten steel base along De Boom Street to be compatible with the district's characteristics. This material seems incongruous with the surrounding district. The Project Sponsor should consider an articulated brick base or colored concrete, which are common features found among the district's contributors. The Project Sponsor will need to select an alternate exterior material for this element.

The ARC concurs with the staff recommendation regarding the addition of a secondary roofline/cap along Federal Street. Given the prevalence of the district's roofline termination, the

ARC finds that additional articulation is warranted in this location, since a roofline termination is commonly found along the street facade. The Project Sponsor will need to redesign this façade to add a roofline element or cap.

The ARC has no issues with the current configuration of the entryway along De Boom Street. To improve the entryway, the ARC recommends continued dialogue with Department staff to refine the handrails and landscaping.

From: [Sucre, Richard \(CPC\)](#)
To: [Kwiatkowska, Natalia \(CPC\)](#)
Subject: FW: 77/85 Federal St Development - Questions from Neighbor
Date: Monday, June 12, 2017 9:10:29 AM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[image002.png](#)
[image003.png](#)
[image004.png](#)
[image005.png](#)
[Mimecast Large File Send Instructions.msg](#)

Richard Sucre
Senior Planner/Team Leader, Southeast Quadrant-Current Planning Division
Preservation Technical Specialist

Planning Department | City and County of San Francisco
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, CA 94103
Direct: 415-575-9108 | Fax: 415-558-6409
Email: richard.sucre@sfgov.org
Web: www.sfplanning.org



From: Siobhan Vignoles [<mailto:svignoles@swigco.com>]
Sent: Friday, February 10, 2017 10:04 AM
To: Julie Zaoui; Poling, Jeanie (CPC)
Cc: Sucre, Richard (CPC)
Subject: RE: 77/85 Federal St Development - Questions from Neighbor

I'm using Mimecast to share large files with you. Please see the attached instructions.

Hello Jeanie,

We appreciate your response. Federal Street has become very congested. Recently, the City notified the Academy of Art University that their vehicles can no longer stop on 2nd Street and must pick up & drop off on Federal Street. These vehicles park in the No Parking zones all along Federal Street and use our garage ramp to make the tricky U-turn. We are reviewing our options for installing a boom gate at the top of our ramp, leaving less room for the U-turn.

I attached a few videos showing the activity on an average day. With the 100s of new occupants expected at 77/85 Federal Street, there will only be an increased number of Ubers and deliveries to their front door on Federal.

Please review and advise us on how the City will handle traffic on Federal Street.

Thanks very much in advance,
Siobhan

Siobhan Vignoles

Sr. Property Manager
The Swig Company
501 Second Street, Suite 210
San Francisco, CA 94107
Office: 415.615.0501
Direct : 415.615.0355

From: Poling, Jeanie (CPC) [mailto:jeanie.poling@sfgov.org]
Sent: Friday, February 03, 2017 9:52 AM
To: Julie Zaoui
Cc: Siobhan Vignoles; Sucre, Richard (CPC)
Subject: RE: 77/85 Federal St Development - Questions from Neighbor

Hi Julie,

That's right. The memo is documentation that the project doesn't meet the threshold of requiring a transportation impact report.

While the project is expected to add vehicle trips, it's unlikely that there would be any additional traffic along Federal Street because vehicles would access the on-site parking via 2nd Street to De Boom Street and wouldn't enter Federal Street since it's a dead-end street with no vehicle access to the building.

Thanks,
Jeanie

From: Julie Zaoui [mailto:jzaoui@swigco.com]
Sent: Thursday, February 02, 2017 4:46 PM
To: Poling, Jeanie (CPC)
Cc: Siobhan Vignoles; Sucre, Richard (CPC)
Subject: RE: 77/85 Federal St Development - Questions from Neighbor

Thank you for this.

The memo doesn't discuss anything with regards to car traffic that would be increased along Federal St. due to the increased building SF. Do I understand correctly that under the ENV Case section, because the box "TIS / Memo is not required", that there won't be any further studies needed?

Sorry if I'm not reading this correctly – I'm just trying to understand. Thanks!

Julie Zaoui
Property Manager
The Swig Company
501 Second Street, Suite 210
San Francisco, CA 94107
O: (415) 615-0501
F: (415) 615-0596
jzaoui@swigco.com

From: Poling, Jeanie (CPC) [<mailto:jeanie.poling@sfgov.org>]
Sent: Thursday, February 02, 2017 3:16 PM
To: Julie Zaoui
Cc: Siobhan Vignoles; Sucre, Richard (CPC)
Subject: RE: 77/85 Federal St Development - Questions from Neighbor

Hi Julie,

I've attached the transportation memo. The project changed since 2013, and vehicle access to the garage is from De Boom Street and not from Federal Street. I will send you a link to the environmental document when it's published. Please let me know if you have any other questions.

Thanks,

Jeanie Poling

Environmental Planner

Planning Department, City and County of San Francisco
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, CA 94103

Direct: 415-575-9072 **Fax:** 415-558-6409

Email: jeanie.poling@sfgov.org

Web: www.sfplanning.org



Planning Information Center (PIC): 415-558-6377 or pic@sfgov.org

Property Information Map (PIM): <http://propertymap.sfplanning.org>

From: Sucre, Richard (CPC)
Sent: Thursday, February 02, 2017 3:03 PM
To: Julie Zaoui
Cc: Siobhan Vignoles; Poling, Jeanie (CPC)
Subject: RE: 77/85 Federal St Development - Questions from Neighbor

Hi Julie,

Thanks for your email. We anticipate bringing this project to hearing in mid-May 2017. I am currently looking at Commission dates on May 17th for the Historic Preservation Commission and May 18th for the Planning Commission.

I've copied the environmental planner, Jeanie Poling, on this email. Jeanie can help address some of the questions on the transportation.

Rich

Richard Sucre

Senior Planner/Team Leader, Southeast Quadrant-Current Planning Division
Preservation Technical Specialist

Planning Department | City and County of San Francisco

1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, CA 94103
Direct: 415-575-9108 | Fax: 415-558-6409
Email: richard.sucre@sfgov.org
Web: www.sfplanning.org



From: Julie Zaoui [<mailto:jzaoui@swigco.com>]
Sent: Thursday, February 02, 2017 1:50 PM
To: Sucre, Richard (CPC)
Cc: Siobhan Vignoles
Subject: 77/85 Federal St Development - Questions from Neighbor

Hi Richard,

We're a neighbor of 77/85 Federal St, at 501 2nd Street. The back of our building is on Federal Street, which includes access to the 501 2nd parking spaces and garage.

We were contacted by Aralon a few months back and invited to a meeting at their building to discuss their upcoming/proposed development.

In looking at the PPA from 2013, I was curious about if any further transportation studies have been done for this project, in particular with regards to Federal Street.

Increasing the size of 77/85 Federal will increase the amount of traffic on Federal St, so we'd like to see what is going to be required of Aralon / what the City will do to help keep traffic flowing after the development is finished.

Also what is the current timeline of this project? Is there a date for commission hearing?

Thanks,

Julie Zaoui

Property Manager

The Swig Company

501 Second Street, Suite 210

San Francisco, CA 94107

O: (415) 615-0501

F: (415) 615-0596

jzaoui@swigco.com

From: [Sucre, Richard \(CPC\)](#)
To: [Kwiatkowska, Natalia \(CPC\)](#)
Subject: FW: 77-85 Federal Street | Case: 2012.1410
Date: Monday, June 12, 2017 9:10:10 AM
Attachments: [image003.png](#)
[image005.png](#)
[image002.png](#)
[image004.png](#)
[image001.png](#)
[2012.1410U_FederalStreet_Proposal.pdf](#)

FYI

Richard Sucre
Senior Planner/Team Leader, Southeast Quadrant-Current Planning Division
Preservation Technical Specialist

Planning Department | City and County of San Francisco
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, CA 94103
Direct: 415-575-9108 | Fax: 415-558-6409
Email: richard.sucre@sfgov.org
Web: www.sfplanning.org



From: Shelley Parsons [mailto:shellstarrocks@gmail.com]
Sent: Sunday, July 27, 2014 8:14 AM
To: Range, Jessica (CPC)
Cc: MacPherson, Scott (PUC); Sucre, Richard (CPC)
Subject: Re: 77-85 Federal Street | Case: 2012.1410

Dear Jessica—

Thank you for your response with respect to the Environment Impact Report for the Proposal stated above. I would like a copy of the report once it has been completed. Additionally, I am hoping you can assist me with the following.

A group of concerned home owners from our building have been assessing the Preliminary Project Assessment dated February 15, 2013.
Attached PDF for your reference.

Point 17 refers to the Narrow Street Height Provision, and Planning Code Section 261.1 specifies that all subject frontages shall have upper stories set back at least 10 feet at the property line above a height equivalent to 1.25 times the width of the abutting narrow street. No part or feature of a building may penetrate the required setback plane. Please ensure that the project is in compliance with this requirement. This requirement is not variable.

Can you please provide me with an electronic copy of the building plans, including elevations, indicating that the proposed building complies with this Planning Department Code?

Thank you for your time,
Shelley Parsons

On Mon, Jun 23, 2014 at 8:22 AM, Range, Jessica (CPC) <jessica.range@sfgov.org> wrote:
Dear Ms. Parsons,

Thank you for your email. I am copying the environmental coordinator for this project, Scott MacPherson. The Planning Department is currently in the process of preparing the environmental document. Please let Scott know if you wish to receive a copy of this document. Scott can also assist you with questions pertaining to the schedule. You can reach Scott at [\(415\) 551-4525](tel:4155514525). While it is still early in the process, at this point the project may qualify for a Community Plan Exemption because the project is located within the East SoMa Plan area and is consistent with the zoning designations of this plan area.

Should you wish to appeal the environmental document once it has been prepared, the process for appealing an exemption is dictated by Chapter 31 of the San Francisco Administrative Code (http://www.amlegal.com/nxt/gateway.dll?f=templates&fn=default.htm&vid=amlegal:sanfrancisco_ca). Should you wish to comment on other aspects of the project, not related to the environmental review, please contact Rich Sucre at 575-9108 (also copied here).

If you have any further questions, feel free to contact me.

Regards,

Jessica Range
Senior Planner, Environmental Planning

Planning Department, City and County of San Francisco
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, CA 94103

Direct: 415-575-9018 **Fax:** [415-558-6409](tel:4155586409)

Email: Jessica.Range@sfgov.org

Web: www.sfplanning.org



Planning Information Center (PIC): [415-558-6377](tel:4155586377) or pic@sfgov.org
Property Information Map (PIM): <http://propertymap.sfplanning.org>

From: Shelley Parsons [mailto:shellstarrocks@gmail.com]
Sent: Sunday, June 22, 2014 8:02 PM
To: Range, Jessica (CPC)
Subject: 77-85 Federal Street | Case: 2012.1410

Dear Jessica—

I am a concerned resident and owner who will be negatively affected by this proposed development, and am contacting you to understand the project status—and steps available to me for appealing and affecting any progress.

Any additional information will be greatly appreciated.

From: [Sucre, Richard \(CPC\)](#)
To: [Kwiatkowska, Natalia \(CPC\)](#)
Subject: FW: 77-85 Federal Street | Case: 2012.1410
Date: Monday, June 12, 2017 9:10:16 AM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[image002.png](#)
[image003.png](#)
[image004.png](#)

Richard Sucre
Senior Planner/Team Leader, Southeast Quadrant-Current Planning Division
Preservation Technical Specialist

Planning Department | City and County of San Francisco
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, CA 94103
Direct: 415-575-9108 | Fax: 415-558-6409
Email: richard.sucre@sfgov.org
Web: www.sfplanning.org



From: Shelley Parsons [mailto:shellstarrocks@gmail.com]
Sent: Sunday, June 22, 2014 8:18 PM
To: Sucre, Richard (CPC)
Subject: 77-85 Federal Street | Case: 2012.1410

Dear Richard—

I am a resident and owner on Federal Street, and I have serious concerns about the impact of this proposed development on the historic nature of our street—and neighborhood.

I'm contacting you to understand the project status, and find out whether there are steps available to me to appeal—and affect—this development.

I'll follow up with a phone call this week, but any additional information will be greatly appreciated.

Kind regards,
Shelley Parsons

GENERAL CONDITIONS

CONTRACTORS RESPONSIBILITIES:

- 1.CONTRACTOR TO PROVIDE ALL WORK AND MATERIALS IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE 2010 CBC AS AMENDED BY ALL STATE AND LOCAL CODES, AND CALIFORNIA ADMINISTRATIVE CODE, TITLE 24, DISABLED ACCESS COMPLIANCE REGULATIONS.
- 2.CONTRACTOR SHALL MAKE SITE INSPECTIONS AND BE RESPONSIBLE FOR ALL NEW AND DEMOLITION WORK, WHETHER DETAILED BY THE SPECIFICATIONS AND DRAWINGS, OR IMPLIED BY EXISTING CONDITIONS.
- 3.ANY DISCREPANCIES IN THE CONSTRUCTION DOCUMENTS, AS CONFLICTS WITH ACTUAL SITE CONDITIONS SHALL BE BROUGHT TO THE ATTENTION OF THE ARCHITECT BEFORE PROCEEDING WITH THE WORK.
- 4.CONTRACTOR SHALL PROVIDE ALL TEMPORARY SHORING & UNDERPINNING AS NECESSARY; WORK TO BE PERFORMED UNDER SEPARATE PERMIT.
- 5.CONTRACTOR SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE TO COORDINATE AND PROVIDE ALL NECESSARY TEMPORARY UTILITY HOOK-UPS FOR ALL EQUIPMENT DURING CONSTRUCTION.
- 6.CONTRACTOR SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR DISCONNECTION / CAPPING OFF OF ALL EXISTING UTILITIES AND RE-CONNECTION WHERE RE-USE IS POSSIBLE.
- 7.CONFIRM ALL WINDOW SIZES WITH ACTUAL / EXISTING ROUGH OPENING DIMENSIONS PRIOR TO ORDERING WINDOWS.
- 8.SLOPE ALL FLOORS / ROOFS TO DRAIN A MINIMUM OF 1/4" PER 1'-0", UNLESS SPECIFICALLY NOTED OTHERWISE.
9. CONTRACTOR IS RESPONSIBLE TO PROCURE STATE INDUSTRIAL SAFETY PERMIT FOR ANY WORK OVER 36' IN HEIGHT, INVOLVING EXCAVATION OVER 5' & AS OTHERWISE REQUIRED.
- DRAWINGS:
- 1.DO NOT SCALE DRAWINGS! ALL WRITTEN DIMENSIONS SUPERSEDE SCALED DIMENSIONS.
- 2.ALL DIMENSIONS ARE TO "FACE OF STUD" UNLESS SPECIFICALLY NOTED OTHERWISE. EXISTING DIMENSIONS DENOTED BY "(E)" ARE TO "FACE OF EXISTING FINISH" UNLESS SPECIFICALLY NOTED OTHERWISE. ALL EXISTING DIMENSIONS SHALL BE FIELD VERIFIED PRIOR TO PROCEEDING WITH THE WORK.
- 3.LARGE SCALE DRAWINGS TAKE PRECEDENCE OVER SMALL SCALE DRAWINGS. WRITTEN SPECIFICATIONS TAKE PRECEDENCE OVER ALL DRAWINGS.
- 4.REFER TO EXTERIOR ELEVATIONS FOR INDICATIONS OF WINDOW OPERATION AND HANDING.
- ASSEMBLIES:
(SEE LEGEND FOR RATED WALL DESIGNATIONS AND OTHER WALL TYPES)
- 1.PROVIDE MINIMUM 1-HOUR WALL AND FLOOR / CEILING ASSEMBLY BETWEEN ALL RESIDENTIAL UNITS. SEE PLANS AND BUILDING SECTIONS FOR DESIGNATIONS; AND STANDARD DETAILS FOR COMPLETE ASSEMBLY DESCRIPTIONS.
- 2.PROVIDE MINIMUM 50 STC AND IIC REQUIREMENT AT ALL UNITS AT FLOORS,CEILINGS, AND WALLS. SEE PLANS AND BUILDING SECTIONS FOR DESIGNATIONS; AND STANDARD DETAILS FOR ASSEMBLY DESCRIPTIONS.
- 3.INSULATE ALL ASSEMBLIES BETWEEN HEATED AND UNHEATED AREAS: R-30 AT ROOFS, R-13 AT WALLS, R-19 AT FLOORS; MINIMUM, UNLESS SPECIFICALLY NOTED OTHERWISE. SEE TITLE 24, ENERGY COMPLIANCE STATEMENT MANDATORY MEASURES CHECKLIST FOR SPECIFIC REQUIREMENTS.
- 4.PROVIDE VENTILATION OF ALL JOIST, STUD AND RAFTER SPACES ENCLOSED BY BUILDING ASSEMBLIES BETWEEN HEATED AND UNHEATED AREAS INCLUDING:ATTICS, BASEMENTS, ROOFS, SOFFITS, PARAPET AND RAILING WALLS, ETC.
- 5.ALL DOORS BETWEEN HEATED AND UNHEATED AREAS SHALL BE PROVIDED WITH WEATHER-STRIPPING AND THRESHOLDS.
- 6.ALL PROPERTY LINE WINDOWS (INDICATED ON DRAWINGS BY " ") SHALL BE STEEL SASH WITH FIXED WIRE GLASS, WITH SPRINKLER HEAD PROTECTION PER S.F. BUILDING CODE SECTION 503.5.
- 7.PROVIDE MOISTURE RESISTANT GYPSUM WALL BOARD (MR GWB) ON ALL BATHROOM WALLS. DO NOT USE A CONTINUOUS VAPOR BARRIER BEHIND MR GWB. PROVIDE 30 POUND ROOFING FELT BEHIND FINISH SURFACE OF ALL TUB / SHOWER SURROUNDS, LAPPING ALL SEAMS. DO NOT USE MR GWB ON BATHROOM CEILINGS; USE 5/8" TYPE "X" GWB.
- MECHANICAL AND ELECTRICAL:
1. MECHANICAL AND ELECTRICAL WORK SHOWN ON DRAWINGS IS SCHEMATIC IN NATURE: CONTRACTOR TO CONFIRM FINAL LAYOUT WITH ARCHITECT, PRIOR TO PROCEEDING WITH THE WORK.
2. ALL WORK TO BE PERFORMED UNDER SEPARATE PERMIT.
3. PARKING GARAGE(S), CORRIDORS AND STAIRS SHALL BE VENTILATED AS REQUIRED PER CODE.
4. PROVIDE EMERGENCY / EXIT LIGHTING AT ALL EXIT PATHS OF TRAVEL AS REQUIRED PER CODE.
5. ALL INTERIOR COMMON AREA LIGHT FIXTURES, ETC. SHALL BE PROVIDED WITH SWITCHING VIA CENTRAL PHOTO-ELECTRIC SENSOR WITH TIMER CLOCK SWITCH OVERRIDE, UNLESS OTHERWISE SPECIFIED.
6. PARKING GARAGE(S) AND ALL OTHER COMMON AREAS, NOT SERVED BY DAY LIGHTING WINDOWS, SHALL BE PROVIDED WITH ELECTRIC LIGHTING 24 HOURS PER DAY, UNLESS SPECIFICALLY NOTED OTHERWISE.
7. ALL ELECTRICAL RECEPTACLES IN DAMP LOCATIONS TO BE GROUND FAUL INTERRUPTER (GFI) AS REQUIRED PER CODE.
- WATERPROOFING:
- 1.ALL SHEET METAL WORK TO BE IN ACCORDANCE WITH CURRENT EDITION OF S.M.A.C.N.A. STANDARDS.
- 2.PROVIDE GALVANIZED SHEET METAL FLASHING AT ALL WINDOW AND DOOR HEADS: INSTALL UNDER EXTERIOR SIDING OR CEMENT PLASTER AND BUILDING PAPER, AND OVER HEAD FRAME OF ALL NEW DOORS AND WINDOWS.
PROVIDE ADDITIONAL FLASHING MEMBRANE PER STANDARD WINDOW FLASHING DETAIL (SEE DETAIL SHEETS) AROUND ALL WINDOW AND DOOR OPENINGS.
- 3.PROVIDE GALVANIZED SHEET METAL FLASHING AT ALL ROOF CONDITIONS INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO: PERIMETER EDGES, VALLEYS, PARAPET CAPS, WALL / ROOF INTERSECTIONS, ROOF PENETRATIONS, ETC. SEE DETAIL SHEETS FOR SPECIFIC REQUIREMENTS.
- 4.ALL NEW EXTERIOR FINISHES TO BE INSTALLED OVER A MINIMUM MOISTURE BARRIER OF TWO LAYERS OF 15 POUND (GRADE D) BUILDING PAPER

BUILDING DEPARTMENT NOTES

- APPLICABLE BUILDING CODES:**
2010 SAN FRANCISCO BUILDING CODE (CONSISTS OF 2010 CALIFORNIA BUILDING CODE); 2010 CALIFORNIA MECHANICAL, ELECTRICAL AND PLUMBING CODES; 2010 SAN FRANCISCO FIRE CODE & NFPA-13 2010 ENERGY CODE.
- CONSTRUCTION TYPE:**
FIVE STORIES OF TYPE III-A, NON RATED CONSTRUCTION
- AUTOMATIC FIRE SPRINKLER SYSTEM PROVIDED THROUGHOUT.
- CHAPTER 3: OCCUPANCY CLASSIFICATION**
PER SECTION 304: A-3 ASSEMBLY- FITNESS CENTER, BUSINESS GROUP B, S-2 PARKING GARAGE. OUTDOOR DECK AT OFFICE LEVELS IS CONSIDERED AN ACCESSORY USE TO THE B OCCUPANCY.
- CHAPTER 4: SPECIAL USE AND CLASSIFICATION:**
NOT APPLICABLE
- CHAPTER 5: HEIGHTS AND AREAS**
MAXIMUM BUILDING HEIGHT AREA, AND NUMBER OF STORIES:
PER TABLE 503 TYPE III-A
HEIGHT ALLOWED IS 65'-0". *PROPOSED BUILDING IS 65'-0". BUILDING COMPLIES.*
STORIES ALLOWED IS 5 . *PROPOSED BUILDING IS 5 STORIES. BUILDING COMPLIES.*
- PER TABLE 503: THE ALLOWABLE AREA PER FLOOR:
A-3 OCCUPANCY: 14,000 SQ.FT. PER STORY (MAXIMUM FLOOR AREA PROVIDED PER STORY OCCURS AT GROUND FLOOR: *11,268 GROSS SQ. FT. PROPOSED BUILDING COMPLIES.*).
- B OCCUPANCY = 28,500 SQ.FT. PER STORY (MAXIMUM FLOOR AREA PROVIDED PER STORY OCCURS AT SECOND FLOOR: *13,936 GROSS SQ.FT. PROPOSED BUILDING COMPLIES.*).
- S-2 OCCUPANCY = 39,000 SQ.FT. PER STORY (MAXIMUM FLOOR AREA PROVIDED PER STORY OCCURS AT BASEMENT: *6,070 GROSS SQ.FT. PROPOSED BUILDING COMPLIES.*).
- NOTE: HEIGHT INCREASE ALLOWANCE (PER SECT 504.2) AND AREA INCREASE ALLOWANCE (PER SECT 506.3) WHERE A BUILDING IS EQUIPPED THROUGH OUT WITH AN AUTOMATIC SPRINKLER SYSTEM IN ACCORDANCE WITH SECTION 903.1.1. ARE NOT UTILIZED IN THIS PROJECT.
- PER SECTION 506.5 .2 FOR BUILDINGS WITH MORE THAN ONE STORY ABOVE THE GRADE PLANE AND CONTAINING MIXED OCCUPANCIES, EACH STORY SHALL INDIVIDUALLY COMPLY WITH APPLICABLE REQUIREMENTS OF SECTION 508.1
- PER TABLE 508.4 REQUIRED SEPARATION OF OCCUPANCIES:
A-3 AND B: 1 HOUR.
A-3 AND S-2: 1 HOUR.
- CHAPTER 6: TYPES OF CONSTRUCTION**
PER CBC TABLE 601: FIRE RESISTIVE RATING REQUIREMENTS FOR BUILDING ELEMENTS:
PRIMARY STRUCTURAL FRAME: 1 HOUR
BEARING WALLS EXTERIOR: 2 HOUR
BEARING WALLS INTERIOR: 1 HOUR
NON BEARING WALLS AND PARTITIONS INTERIOR: NON RATED
FLOOR CONSTRUCTION AND SECONDARY MEMBERS: 1 HOUR
ROOF CONSTRUCTION AND SECONDARY MEMBERS: 1 HOUR
- PER CBC TABLE 602: NON LOAD BEARING EXTERIOR WALLS FOR TYPE IIIA, B OCCUPANCY: LESS THAN 5'-0" FROM PROPERTY LINE : 1HOUR REQUIRED.
GREATER THAN 10'-0" LESS THAN 30'-0" FROM PROPERTY LINE: 1 HOUR REQUIRED
GREATER THAN 30'-0" FROM PROPERTY LINE: NON RATED
- EAST & WEST EXTERIOR WALLS ARE NON LOAD BEARING AND LESS THAN 5'-0" AWAY FROM PROPERTY LINE. THEY SHALL BE OF ONE HOUR FIRE RESISTIVE CONSTRUCTION.
- NORTH AND SOUTH WALLS ARE NON LOAD BEARING AND ON STREET FRONTAGES. CENTER LINE OF STREET IS ASSUMED PROPERTY LINE. (17'-6") PER TABLE 602 EXCEPTION E, FIRE RESISTIVE CONSTRUCTION SHALL BE DETERMINED WHERE REQUIRED PER STORY.
- CHAPTER 7 FIRE RESISTIVE CONSTRUCTION**
EXTERIOR WALLS
PER SECTION 705.5 FIRE RESISTIVE RATINGS: EXTERIOR WALLS SHALL BE FIRE RESISTISANCE RATED FOR EXPOSURE ON BOTH SIDES WHERE A FIRE SEPARATION DISTANCE OF LESS THAN OR EQUAL TO 10'-0" OCCURS.
- EAST AND WEST EXTERIOR PROPERTY LINE WALLS SHALL BE FIRE RESISTANCE RATED FROM BOTH SIDES.
- NORTH AND SOUTH WALLS SHALL BE RATED AS REQUIRED ON EXTERIOR SIDE ONLY.
- MAXIMUM EXTERIOR WALL OPENINGS: PER TABLE 705.8: FIRE SEPARATION DISTANCE OF BETWEEN 15'-0" TO LESS THAN 20'-0" ALLOWS:
25% UNPROTECTED NON SPRINKLERED (UP,NS) OPENINGS
75% UNPROTECTED SPRINKLERED (UP ,S) OPENINGS.
75% PROTECTED OPENINGS.
PERCENTAGE ALLOWED IS AS AN AREA OF THE EXTERIOR WALL PER STORY.
- PER CBC SECTION 705.8.1 EXEPTION 1.1.1: IN THE FIRST STORY ABOVE GRADE UNLIMITED UNPROTECTED OPENINGS ARE ALLOWED WHERE A WALL FACES A STREET AND HAS A FIRE SEPARATION DISTANCE OF MORE THAN 15'-0".
- NORTH AND SOUTH WALLS COMPLY WITH EXCEPTION. UNLIMITED UNPROTECTED OPENINGS SHALL BE UTILIZED.
- SHAFTS:
PER SECTION 708.4 SHAFT ENLCOSURES SHALL HAVE A FIRE RESISTIVE RATING OF NOT LESS THAN 2 HOURS WHEN CONNECTING FOUR STORIES OR MORE. AND SHALL INCLUDE ANY BASEMENT.
- PER SECTION 708.6 WHERE EXTERIOR WALLS SERVE AS PART OF A REQUIRED SHAFT ENCLOSURE SUCH WALLS SHALL COMPLY WITH THE REQUIREMENTS OF SECTION 705 FOR EXTERIOR WALLS AND THE FIRE RESITANCE RATED ENCLOSURE REQUIREMENTS SHALL NOT APPLY.
- PER SECTION 708.14.1 AN ENCLOSED ELEVATOR LOBBY SHALL BE PROVIDED AT EACH FLOOR.
- PER EXCEPTION 1: AN ENCLOSED ELEVATOR LOBBY IS NOT REQUIRED TO BE ENCLOSED AT THE STREET FLOOR PROVIDED THE ENTIRE STREET FLOOR IS EQUIPPED THROUGHOUT WITH AN AUTOMATIC SPRINKLER SYSTEM IN ACCORDANCE WITH SECTION 903.3.1.1
- PER EXCEPTION 3: ENCLOSED ELEVATOR LOBBIES ARE NOT REQUIRED WHERE ADDITIONAL DOORS ARE PROVIDED AT THE HOISWAY OPENING IN ACCORDANCE WITH SECTION 3002.6
- PER EXCEPTION 4: ENCLOSED ELEVATOR LOBBIES ARE NOT REQUIRED WHERE THE BUILDING IS PROTECTED BY AN AUTOMATIC SPRINKLER SYSTEM INSTALLED IN ACCORDANCE WITH SECTION 903.1.1.1.
- PER SECTION 708.14.1.1 AREAS OF REFUGE SHALL BE PROVIDE AS REQUIRED IN SECTION 1007.
- PER SECTION 709.5: WHERE EXTERIOR WALLS SERVE AS PART OF A REQUIRED FIRE RESISTANCE RATED SEPARATION, SUCH WALLS SHALL COMPLY WITH THE REQUIREMENTS OF SECTION 705 FOR EXTERIOR WALLS AND THE FIRE RATED SEPARATION REQUIREMENST SHALL NOT APPLY. (EXCEPTION: EXTERIOR WALLS REQUIRED TO BE RATED IN ACCORDANCE WITH SECTION 1022.6 FOR EXIT ENCLOSURES)

BUILDING DEPARTMENT NOTES CONT'D:

- CHAPTER 10: MEANS OF EGRESS**
PER SECTION 1007.1 ACCESSIBLE SPACES SHALL BE PROVIDED WITH NOT LESS THAN ONE ACCESSIBLE MEANS OF AGRESS.
- PER SECTION 1007.2.1 ACCESSIBLE MEANS OF EGRESS. IN BUILDINGS WHERE A REQUIRED ACCESSIBLE FLOOR IS FOUR OR MORE STORIES ABOVE THE LEVEL OF EXIT DISCHARGE, AT LEAST ONE REQUIRED ACCESSIBLE MEANS OF EGRESS SHALL BE AN ELEVATOR COMPLYING WITH SECTION 1007.4
- PER SECTION 1007.2 EACH REQUIRED ACCESSIBLE MEANS OF EGRESS SHALL BE CONINTUOUS TO A PUBLIC WAY
- 1007.4 IN ORDER FOR AN ELEVATOR TO BE CONSIDERED PART OF AN ACCESSIBLE MEANS OF EGRESS IT SHALL COMPLY WITH THE REQUIREMENTS OF SECTION 1007.4 (SEE ALSO SHEET A0.02) PER EXCEPTION 2. ELEVATORS ARE NOT REQUIRED TO BE ACCESSED FROM AN AREA OF REFUGE IN BUILDINGS EQUIPPED THROUGHOUT WITH AN AUTOMATIC FIRE SPRINKLER SYSTEM IN ACCORDANCE WITH SECTION 903.1.1.
- EGRESS** TABLE 1004.1.1. **OCCUPANT LOAD CALCULATION:**
EXERSIZE ROOMS= 50 GROSS
BUSINESS AREAS= 100 GROSS
PARKING GARAGE= 200 GROSS
SEE EXITING DIAGRAM SHEET: XXXX
- PER SECTION 1022.1 INTERIOR EXIT STAIRWAYS SHALL BE ENCLOSED WITH FIRE BARRIERS IN ACCORDANCE WITH SECTION 707.4 AND SHALL HAVE A FIRE REISTANCE RATING OF NOT LESS THAN 2 HOURS. EXIT ENCLOSURES SHALL LEAD DIRECTLY TO THE EXTERIOR OF THE BUILDING WITH AN EXIT PASSAGE CONFORMING TO SECTION 1023 EXCEPT AS PERMITTED IN SECTION 1027.1
- PER SECTION 1027.1 EXITS SHALL DISCHARGE DIRECTLY TO THE EXTERIOR OF THE BUILDING. PER EXCEPTION 1: A MAXIMUM OF 50% OF THE NUMBER OF EXIT ENCLOSURES IS PERMITTED TO EGRESS THROUGH AREAS ON THE LEVEL OF DISCHARGE PROVIDED SUB SECTIONS 1.1 THROUGH 1.3 ARE MET.
STAIR #2 COMPLIES AND EXITS THROUGH THE GROUND FLOOR LOBBY.

FIRE DEPARTMENT NOTES:

- SPRINKLER SYSTEM REQUIRED TO MEET NFPA 13 2010 EDITION: LIGHT HAZARD- THIS IS A COMMERCIAL BUILDING. NOTE: SEWER CONNECTIONS TO FIRE SPRINKLER DRAINS ARE NOT PERMITTED IN AN ENCLOSED STAIRWAY.
- FIRE ALARM TO MEET SECTION 310.10 CBC AND BE MONITORED TO CENTRAL STATION OVER 100 HEADS. SYSTEM TO BE UL CERTIFIED.
- A STANDPIPE SYSTEM IS REQUIRED THROUGH OUT PER NFPA 13, PROVIDE OUTLET IN EACH STAIRWELL AT EACH LEVEL.
- FIRE EXTINGUISHERS, OF 2A10BC RATING, TO BE PROVIDED ON EACH LEVEL WITH A MAXIMUM OF 75 FEET TRAVEL DISTANCE FORM THE EXTINGUISHER. PLANS AND INSTALLATIONS TO MEET NFPA 13 AS ABOVE AND SAN FRANCISCO FIRE DEPARTMENT ADMINISTRATE BULLETINS. SEPARATE ELECTRICAL AND PLUMBING PERMITS ARE REQUIRED.
- THIS BUILDING IS B OCCUPANCY BUILDING OVER A S-2 PARKING GARAGE. PROVIDE A LOCK BOX PER FIRE DEPARTMENT DISTRICT INSPECTOR.
- LOW LEVEL EXIT SIGNS REQUIRED WITH GENERAL EXIT SIGNS.

DPW STREET IMPROVEMENT NOTES

- DPW / BSM SITE MEETING REQUIRED; CALL 415-554-7149 TO ARRANGE APPOINTMENT WITH INSPECTOR.
- OFFICIAL SIDEWALK SLOPE IS 1/5" PER FOOT RISE FROM CURB GRADE TO PROPERTY LINE. ALL ENTRANCES, BOTH PEDESTRIAN AND VEHICULAR, SHALL MEET SIDEWALK GRADE. ALL RAMPING SHALL BE INSIDE OF PROPERTY LINE. DRIVEWAYS AND SIDEWALKS MUST CONFORM TO CITY REQUIREMENTS. FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CALL BUREAU OF STREET USE & MAPPING @ 415-554-6060.
- ALL ENCROACHMENTS INTO OFFICIAL STREET OR SIDEWALK AREAS MUST BE GRANTED IN WRITING BY THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS OR BY RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS. ALL RAMPING TO BE INSIDE PROPERTY LINE.
- SEPARATE PERMIT REQUIRED FROM BUREAU OF STREET USE & MAPPING FOR POTTED PLANTS & STREET TREES IN SIDEWALK AREAS. FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CALL 415-554-6700.
- DPW / BSM SIGN-OFF REQUIRED ON JOB CARD PRIOR TO DBI FINAL.
- ALL WORK IS SUBJECT TO THE CONDITIONS NOTED ON PENDING DPW STREET IMPROVEMENT PERMIT (WHERE APPLICABLE).

STORM WATER MANAGEMENT

- PROJECT WILL COMPLY STORMWATER DESIGN GUIDELINES AND WILL SUBMIT A STORM WATER CONTROL PLAN TO THE SFPUC FOR REVIEW.

SCOPE OF WORK

- CONSTRUCTION OF NEW FIVE STORY COMMERCIAL BUILDING OVER A BASEMENT w/ COMMERCIAL AND PARTIAL GARAGE.
- EXISTING SITE HAS A TWO STORY BUILDING TO BE DEMOLISHED

PLANNING DEPARTMENT NOTES

- PROJECT LOCATION: 77 FEDERAL STREET
ZONING DISTRICT: MUO: MIXED OFFICE USE, EASTERN NEIGHBORHOODS
HEIGHT & BULK DISTRICT: 65-X
SPECIAL USE DISTRICT: NONE
SPECIAL SIGN DISTRICT: SOUTH OF MARKET MIXED USE DISTRICT CODE:607.2
SETBACKS: NONE
COSTAL ZONE: NOT IN COSTAL ZONE
PORT: NOT UNDER JURISDICTION
LIMITED AND NONCONFORMING USE: NONE
REDEVELOPMENT AREA: NONE
PRESERVATION: SOUTH END HD- *FOUND INELLIGIBLE TO BE CONTRIBUTORY*
BLOCK AND LOT: 3774 Lot 071 & 072
- The Mixed Use–Office (MUO) runs predominantly along the 2nd Street corridor in the South of Market area. The MUO is designed to encourage office uses and housing, as well as small-scale light industrial and arts activities. Nighttime entertainment is permitted as a conditional use. Dwelling units and group housing are permitted, while demolition or conversion of existing dwelling units or group housing requires conditional use authorization. Family-sized housing is encouraged.
- Office, general commercial, most retail, production, distribution, and repair uses are also principal permitted uses.** Large hotel, adult entertainment and heavy industrial uses are not permitted.

- Ground Floor Ceiling Height. Unless otherwise established elsewhere in this Code:
Section 145.1 (4), (B): Ground floor non-residential uses in all C–3, C–M, NCT, DTR, Chinatown Mixed Use, RSD, SLR, SLI, SPD, SSO, MUG, MUR, and MUO Districts shall have a minimum floor-to-floor height of 14 feet, as measured from grade.

PLANNING DEPARTMENT NOTES CONT'D:

- LOT AREA**
8,047 SQ.FT.
8,000 SQ.FT.
16,047 SQ.FT. =.37 ACRES
- FLOOR AREA RATIO (FAR)**
PER PLANNING CODE SECTION 124: MUG, MUO, MUR, UMU, PDR–1–B, PDR–1–D, PDR–1–G, and PDR–2 in a 65 or 68 foot height district = 5.0 to 1
5 * 16,047 SQ.FT. = 80,235 GR.SQ.FT. (*max. allowable gross square footage*)
- GROSS BUILDING AREA:**
- | FLOOR | AREA | USE | COMMENTS | |
|-----------------|------------------|---------------------------|---|-----------------|
| BASEMENT LEVEL: | 8,789 GR.SQ.FT. | RETAIL (<i>FITNESS</i>) | <i>(EXCLUDES VEHICLE AND SERV. PRKG AND AND CAR SHARE AND DRIVE RAMP)</i> | 6,324 gr.sq.ft |
| FIRST FLOOR: | 13,842 GR.SQ.FT. | RETAIL (<i>FITNESS</i>) | <i>(EXCLUDES MECH. AND BICYCLE PRKG)</i> | 1,635 gr.sq.ft |
| TOTAL RETAIL: | 22,631 GR.SQ.FT | | | |
| SECOND FLOOR: | 14,952 GR.SQ.FT. | OFFICE | <i>(EXCLUDES BICYCLE PARKING)</i> | 575 gr.sq.ft |
| THIRD FLOOR: | 13,840 GR.SQ.FT. | OFFICE | <i>(EXCLUDES BICYCLE PARKING)</i> | 575 gr.sq.ft |
| FOURTH FLOOR: | 10,524 GR.SQ.FT. | OFFICE | <i>(EXCLUDES BICYCLE PARKING)</i> | 575 gr.sq.ft |
| FIFTH FLOOR: | 10,524 GR.SQ.FT. | OFFICE | <i>(EXCLUDES BICYCLE PARKING)</i> | 575 gr.sq.ft |
| ROOF: | 0 GR.SQ.FT. | | | |
| TOTA OFFICE: | 49,840 GR.SQ.FT | | | |
| TOTA AREA: | 72,471 GR.SQ.FT | | | 10,259 gr sq.ft |
- TOTA AREA: 72,471 GR.SQ.FT <80,235 GR.SQ.FT. BUILDING COMPLIES
- VEHICULAR PARKING:**
Per Table 151.1:
Retail:
All retail in the Eastern Neighborhoods Mixed Use Districts where any portion of the parcel is less than 1/4 mile from 3rd Streets. P up to one for each 1,500 square feet of gross floor area.
22,631 / 1,500 SQ.FT. = 15 MAXIMUM STALLS ALLOWABLE
Office:
No Parking is required for any use in the MUO. Up to 7% of the gross floor area may be devoted to office parking
.07 * 49,840 SQ.FT. = 3,488 SQ.FT. MAX. ALLOWABLE
185 SQ.FT. PER CAR ALLOWABLE
3,488 SQ.FT./185 SQ.FT.= 18 STALLS MAX. ALLOWABLE
TOTAL STALLS MAXIMUM ALLOWABLE = 15 + 18 = 33 STALLS
STALLS PROVIDED: 20 (10 INDEPENDENTLY ACCESSIBLE STACKER STALLS)
04 SURFACE STALLS
01 HANDICAP VAN STALL
TOTAL: 25 TOTAL INDEPENDANT PARKING STALLS < 32 STALLS ALLOWABLE
- Car-Share Parking.** Any off-street parking space dedicated for use as a car-share parking space, as defined in Section 166, shall not be credited toward the total parking permitted as accessory in this Section
Per Table 166: 01 CAR SHARE STALL REQUIRED PER 25-49 STALLS PROVIDED
01 CAR SHARE STALL PROVIDED
- LOADING:**
Per Table: 152.1 **Retail:** 1 space per 10,001–30,000 gr. sq. ft.
10,000 GR.SQ.FT. < 22,631 GR.SQ.FT. < 30,000 GR.SQ.FT.
ONE FREIGHT LOADING STALL OR TWO SERVICE VEHICLES STALLS REQ'D.
Office: 0.1 space per 10,000 sq. ft. of gross floor area (to closest whole number per Section 153)
49,840 GR. SQ.FT./10,000 *.1= .49
NO FREIGHT LOADING STALL REQ'D.
TOTAL: 2 SERVICE VEHICLE STALLS REQ'D.
2 SERVICE VEHICLE STALLS PROVIDED
- BICYCLE PARKING:**
Per Section 155.2 **Retail: Class 1**
Minimum two spaces. One Class 1 space for every 15,000 square feet of occupied floor area.
BASEMENT 7,397 fir area-occupied
GROUND 12,096
19,493 .SQ.FT. / 15,000.SQ.FT.= 2 STALLS REQUIRED
36 CLASS 1 BICYCLE PARKING SPACE PROVIDED
Office: Class 1
One Class 1 space for every 5,000 occupied square feet.
2ND 13,065 fir area-occupied
3RD 12,263
4TH 8,887
5TH 8,887
43,102
43,102 SQ.FT. / 5,000.SQ.FT.= 9 STALL REQUIRED
9 CLASS 1 BICYCLE PARKING SPACES PROVIDED.
79 ADDITIONAL STALLS PROVIDED
TOTAL: 124 BICYCLE PARKING SPACES
Retail: Class 2
Minimum two spaces. One Class 2 space for every 2,500 square feet of occupied floor area. 19,493 sq. ft. / 2,500 = 8 Class 2 Spaces Required.
8 Class 2 BICYCLE PARKING SPACES PROVIDED
Office: Class 2
Minimum two spaces Required for Office use greater than 5,000. square feet / under 50,000 sq. ft.
2 Class 2 BICYCLE PARKING SPACES PROVIDED
- DIAPER CHANGING STATION:**
Per Section 168
Project will provide a minimum of 1 diaper changing station at the basement and ground floor level that is accessible to both men and women
- OPEN SPACE REQUIREMENT**
Per Table 135.3
Retail:
1 sq. ft. per 250 sq. ft. of occupied floor area of new or added square footage
19,493 SQ.FT./250 = 78 sq.ft. required.
78 sq.ft. provided on 4TH FLOOR roof deck
Office:
1 sq. ft. per 50 sq. ft. of occupied floor area of new, converted or added square footage
43,102 SQ.FT./50 = 862 sq.ft. required
862 sq.ft. provided on 4TH FLOOR roof deck
940 sq.ft. total (At the 3rd & 4th Floors there is a Total of 4,057 sq. ft. of Open Area)

1331 HARRISON STREET
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94103
TEL: 415.882.9793 FAX: 415.882.9796

STERNBERG
BENJAMIN
ARCHITECTS

www.sternbergbenjamin.com

DAVID
STERNBERG
No. D-11102
2/19
RENEWAL DATE

STATE OF CALIFORNIA


PROJECT NOTES

FEDERAL & DE BOOM
SAN FRANCISCO, CA
BLOCK: 3774 LOT 444


Revision	Date
Pre App	12.17.2012.
EE	03.22.2013
NOPDR #1	11.02.2015
NOPDR #2	03.29.16
ARC Response	07.08.16
NOPDR #3	06.08.17
Date:	11.05.2012
Scale:	
Drawn:	ABM
Sheet:	

TS.01


BUILDING AREA CALCULATIONS		
GROSS AREA	INCLUDED	EXCLUDED
FITNESS & STAIR #3	7,645 gr.sq.ft	
GARAGE & CAR SHARE TRASH LOADING	365 gr.sq.ft	4,903 gr.sq.ft 696 gr.sq.ft
CIRCULATION DRIVE RAMP		725 gr.sq.ft
STAIR #1	256 gr.sq.ft	
STAIR #2	182 gr.sq.ft	
ELEVATOR & LOBBY	341 gr.sq.ft	
TOTAL	8,789 gr.sq.ft	6,324 gr.sq.ft
FLOOR AREA OCCUPIED		
FITNESS	7,397 sq.ft.	




BUILDING AREA CALCULATIONS		
GROSS AREA	INCLUDED	EXCLUDED
FITNESS & STAIR #3 FOYER & LOBBY ELEVATOR	12,295 gr sq.ft 910 gr sq.ft 160 gr sq.ft	
MECH. BICYCLE PARKING		770 gr sq.ft 865 gr sq.ft
CIRCULATION STAIR #1 & VEST. STAIR #2	295 gr sq.ft 182 gr sq.ft	
TOTAL	13,842 gr sq.ft	1,635 gr sq.ft
FLOOR AREA OCCUPIED		
FITNESS	12,096 sq.ft.	




BUILDING AREA CALCULATIONS		
GROSS AREA	INCLUDED	EXCLUDED
OPEN OFFICE	13,065 gr.sq.ft	
BATHROOM	552 gr.sq.ft	
MAINTENANCE	290 gr.sq.ft	
LOCKERS & SHOWER	310 gr.sq.ft	
BICYCLE PARKING		575 gr.sq.ft
<u>CIRCULATION</u>		
STAIR #1	186 gr.sq.ft	
STAIR #2	184 gr.sq.ft	
ELEVATOR & LOBBY	365 gr.sq.ft	
TOTAL	14,952 gr sq ft	575 gr sq ft
FLOOR AREA OCCUPIED		
OPEN OFFICE	13,065 sq.ft.	




BUILDING AREA CALCULATIONS		
GROSS AREA	INCLUDED	EXCLUDED
OPEN OFFICE	12,263 gr.sq.ft.	
BATHROOM	552 gr.sq.ft.	
MAINTENANCE	290 gr.sq.ft.	
BICYCLE PARKING		575 gr.sq.ft.
<u>CIRCULATION</u>		
STAIR #1	186 gr.sq.ft.	
STAIR #2	184 gr.sq.ft.	
ELEVATOR & LOBBY	365 gr.sq.ft.	
TOTAL	13,840 gr sq ft	575 gr sq ft
FLOOR AREA OCCUPIED		
OPEN OFFICE	12,263 sq.ft.	



BUILDING AREA CALCULATIONS		
GROSS AREA	INCLUDED	EXCLUDED
OPEN OFFICE	8,887 gr.sq.ft.	
BATHROOM	552 gr.sq.ft.	
MAINTENANCE	290 gr.sq.ft.	
BICYCLE PARKING		575 gr.sq.ft.
<u>CIRCULATION</u>		
STAIR #1	186 gr.sq.ft.	
STAIR #2	184 gr.sq.ft.	
ELEVATOR & LOBBY	425 gr.sq.ft.	
TOTAL	10,524 gr.sq.ft.	575 gr.sq.ft.
FLOOR AREA OCCUPIED		
OPEN OFFICE	8,887 sq.ft.	



BUILDING AREA CALCULATIONS		
GROSS AREA	INCLUDED	EXCLUDED
OPEN OFFICE	8,887 gr.sq.ft	
BATHROOM	552 gr.sq.ft	
MAINTENANCE	290 gr.sq.ft	
BICYCLE PARKING		575 gr.sq.ft
<u>CIRCULATION</u>		
STAIR #1	186 gr.sq.ft	
STAIR #2	184 gr.sq.ft	
ELEVATOR & LOBBY	425 gr.sq.ft	
TOTAL	10,524 gr.sq.ft	575 gr.sq.ft
FLOOR AREA OCCUPIED		
OPEN OFFICE	8,887 sq.ft.	




AREA DIAGRAMS- PLANNING


FEDERAL & DE BOOM
SAN FRANCISCO, CA
BLOCK: 3774 LOT 444

Revision	Date
Pre App	12.17.2012.
EE	03.22.2013
NOPDR #1	11.02.2015
NOPDR #2	03.29.16
ARC Response	07.08.16
NOPDR #3	06.08.17

Date:	11.05.2012
Scale:	1/8" = 1'-0"
Drawn:	ABM
Sheet:	

P1.00





The FAR for the site is 5. Which gives us a max allowable sq.ft of **80,235 sq.ft.** as noted on our original sheet submitted to Planning We can take out for parking, building maintenance rooms, but not elevator or stairs, or structure.

SECTION (LOOKING EAST)

BUILDING ENVELOPE
SECTION
AT SITE MID POINT

FEDERAL & DE BOOM
SAN FRANCISCO, CA
BLOCK: 3774 LOT 444

Revision	Date
Pre App	12.17.2012.
EE	03.22.2013
NOPDR #1	11.02.2015
NOPDR #2	03.29.16
ARC Response	07.08.16

Date:	11.05.2012
Scale:	
Drawn:	ABM
Sheet:	



1) FEDERAL STREET: VIEW LOOKING EAST



2) FEDERAL STREET: VIEW LOOKING WEST



3) FEDERAL STREET: VIEW LOOKING SOUTH EAST
(ADJANCET PROPERTY)



4) DE BOOM STREET: VIEW LOOKING NORTHWEST



5) DE BOOM STREET: VIEW LOOKING NORTH
(ADJACENT PROPERTY)




EXISTING SITE PLAN


Revision	Date
Pre App	12.17.2012
EE	03.22.2013
NOPDR #1	11.02.2015
NOPDR #2	03.29.16
ARC Response	07.08.16

Date:	11.05.2012
Scale:	
Drawn:	ABM
Sheet:	


- KEYNOTES**
- 4 NEW STREET TREE TO BE PROVIDED
 - 5 EXISTING STREET TREE TO BE REMOVED
 - 6 EXISTING STREET TREE TO REMAIN
 - 7 NOT USED
 - 8 EXISTING CURB CUT TO BE REMOVED
 - 9 NEW CURB CUT AT DRIVEWAY ENTRY/EXIT
 - 10 CLASS 2 BICYCLE RACK



Revision	Date
Pre App	12.17.2012
EE	03.22.2013
NOPDR #1	11.02.2015
NOPDR #2	03.29.16
ARC Response	07.08.16
NOPDR #3	06.08.17



BASEMENT FLOOR PLAN 1




GARAGE FLOOR PLAN

FEDERAL & DE BOOM
SAN FRANCISCO, CA
BLOCK: 3774 LOT 444

Revision	Date
Pre App	12.17.2012.
EE	03.22.2013
NOPDR #1	11.02.2015
NOPDR #2	03.29.16
ARC Response	07.08.16
NOPDR #3	06.08.17

Date:	11.05.2012
Scale:	1/8" = 1'-0"
Drawn:	ABM
Sheet:	



FIRST FLOOR PLAN 1

PLAN NORTH

0 1 2 3 4 5 10 15 20


SCALE 1/8" = 1'-0"


FIRST FLOOR PLAN

FEDERAL & DE BOOM
SAN FRANCISCO, CA
BLOCK: 3774 LOT 444

Revision	Date
Pre App	12.17.2012
EE	03.22.2013
NOPDR #1	11.02.2015
NOPDR #2	03.29.16
ARC Response	07.08.16
NOPDR #3	06.08.17

Date: 11.05.2012
Scale:
Drawn: ABM
Sheet:




 **SECOND FLOOR PLAN 1**

0 1 2 3 4 5 10 15 20


SECOND FLOOR PLAN

FEDERAL & DE BOOM
SAN FRANCISCO, CA
BLOCK: 3774 LOT 444

Revision	Date
Pre App	12.17.2012.
EE	03.22.2013
NOPDR #1	11.02.2015
NOPDR #2	03.29.16
ARC Response	07.08.16
NOPDR #3	06.08.17



THIRD FLOOR PLAN 1




THIRDFLOOR PLAN

FEDERAL & DE BOOM
SAN FRANCISCO, CA
BLOCK: 3774 LOT 444

Revision	Date
Pre App	12.17.2012.
EE	03.22.2013
NOPDR #1	11.02.2015
NOPDR #2	03.29.16
ARC Response	07.08.16
NOPDR #3	06.08.17

Date: 11.05.2012
Scale:
Drawn: ABM
Sheet:



FOURTH FLOOR PLAN 1



FOURTH FLOOR

FEDERAL & DE BOOM
SAN FRANCISCO, CA
BLOCK: 3774 LOT 444

Revision	Date
Pre App	12.17.2012
EE	03.22.2013
NOPDR #1	11.02.2015
NOPDR #2	03.29.16
ARC Response	07.08.16
NOPDR #3	06.08.17


Date: 11.05.2012
Scale:
Drawn: ABM
Sheet:



**STERNBERG
BENJAMIN**
ARCHITECTS

1331 HARRISON STREET
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94103
TEL 415 862 9783 FAX 415 862 9786

www.sternbergbenjamin.com



ROOF PLAN

FEDERAL & DE BOOM
SAN FRANCISCO, CA
BLOCK: 3774 LOT 444

Revision	Date
Pre App	12.17.2012.
EE	03.22.2013
NOPDR #1	11.02.2015
NOPDR #2	03.29.16
ARC Response	07.08.16
NOPDR #3	06.08.17

Date:	11.05.2012
Scale:	
Drawn:	ABM
Sheet:	

A1.06




FEDERAL &
DE BOOM
ELEVATIONS


FEDERAL & DE BOOM
SAN FRANCISCO, CA
BLOCK: 3774 LOT 444

Revision	Date
Pre App	12.17.2012
EE	03.22.2013
NOPDR #1	11.02.2015
NOPDR #2	03.29.16
ARC Response	07.08.16
NOPDR #3	06.08.17

Date: 11.05.2012
Scale: 1/8" = 1'-0"
Drawn: ABM
Sheet:



EAST ELV. (PROPERTY LINE) 2




WEST ELV. (PROPERTY LINE) 1

Revision	Date
Pre App	12.17.2012.
EE	03.22.2013
NOPDR #1	11.02.2015
NOPDR #2	03.29.16
ARC Response	07.08.16
NOPDR #3	06.08.17

Date: 11.05.2012
Scale: 1/8" = 1'-0"
Drawn: ABM

Sheet:



SECTION THRU BUILDING

1






SECTION LOOKING EAST

FEDERAL & DE BOOM
SAN FRANCISCO, CA
BLOCK: 3774 LOT 444

Revision	Date
Pre App	12.17.2012
EE	03.22.2013
NOPDR #1	11.02.2015
NOPDR #2	03.29.16
ARC Response	07.08.16
NOPDR #3	06.08.17

Date: 11.05.2012
Scale:
Drawn: ABM
Sheet:

A3.01




3 ENLARGED ELEVATION AT TYPICAL BAY

2 ENLARGED ELEVATION AT MAIN ENTRANCE


1 ENLARGED SECTION AT MAIN ENTRANCE






3 HEAD DETAIL AT CEMENT WALL

3" = 1'-0"



2 JAMB DETAIL AT CEMENT WALL

3" = 1'-0"



1 SILL DETAIL AT CEMENT WALL

3" = 1'-0"

ENLARGED EXTERIOR
DETAILS AT WINDOWS

FEDERAL & DE BOOM
SAN FRANCISCO, CA
BLOCK: 3774 LOT 444

Revision	Date
Pre App	12.17.2012.
EE	03.22.2013
NOPDR #1	11.02.2015
NOPDR #2	03.29.16
ARC Response	07.08.16
NOPDR #3	06.08.17

Date:	11.05.2012
Scale:	
Drawn:	ABM
Sheet:	

ADJ	ADJACENT BUILDING
ASP	ASPHALT
BK	BACK OF WALK
BLDG	BUILDING
CL	CENTER LINE
CNC	CONCRETE
COR	CORNER
ELB	ELECTRIC BOX
EL	ELEVATION
FF	FINISHED FLOOR
FL	FLOW LINE
GM	GAS METER
MH	MANHOLE
PACB	PACIFIC BELL
PGBE	PACIFIC GAS & ELECTRIC
RFPF	ROOF PARAPET
SDI	STORM DRAIN INLET
SS	SANITARY SEWER
TC	TOP OF CURB
TEL	TELEPHONE BOX
UFB	UNIDENTIFIED BOX

	BALLARD
	DIAMETER
	GAS VALVE
	HANDICAP PARKING
	PAINT STRIPE
	POWER POLE
	SANITARY SEWER CLEAN OUT/VENT
	SCRIBE
	SIGN
	SPOT ELEVATION
	RECORD DATA WITH MEASURED
	STORM DRAIN INLET
	TREE
	WATER METER
	WATER VALVE

1. THAT ALL TITLE INFORMATION HEREON INCLUDING EASEMENTS WAS PREPARED SOLELY FOR AND IN STRICT CONFORMANCE WITH OUR CLIENT'S OR HIS AGENT'S REQUIREMENTS AND TITLE INFORMATION SUPPLIED TO FREDERICK T. SEHER & ASSOCIATES, INC.; FURTHERMORE, WE HEREBY DISCLAIM ANY AND ALL TITLE SEARCH RESPONSIBILITY ON THIS JOB.

2. NO PRELIMINARY TITLE REPORT WAS REVIEWED IN CONJUNCTION WITH THIS MAPPING. IT IS RECOMMENDED THAT A TITLE REPORT BE RECEIVED FROM THE OWNER TO VERIFY THE EXISTENCE OF ANY ADDITIONAL EASEMENTS OF RECORD OR LOT LINE ADJUSTMENTS THAT MAY HAVE ALTERED THE INFORMATION SHOWN HEREON PRIOR TO ANY DESIGN AND/OR CONSTRUCTION.

3. THAT THIS MAP WAS PREPARED AS A PROFESSIONAL INSTRUMENT OF SERVICE FOR THOMAS MURPHY AND THAT IT REMAINS THE PROPERTY OF FREDERICK T. SEHER & ASSOCIATES, INC. WHETHER THE PROJECT (IF ANY PROPOSED) ON THIS SITE IS CONSTRUCTED OR NOT.

4. THAT ANY INFORMATION ON THIS MAP AND ANY DOCUMENT(S) PREPARED BY FREDERICK T. SEHER & ASSOCIATES, INC. IN RELATION HEREOF SHALL NOT BE USED FOR ANY OTHER PURPOSE THAN FOR: BUILDING PERMIT. FURTHERMORE, THE USE OF THIS MAP FOR ANY OTHER PURPOSES WHATSOEVER INCLUDING ENGINEERING DESIGNS OF OFFSITE OR ONSITE IMPROVEMENTS IS BEYOND THIS MAP'S PURPOSES, INTENT & CONTRACT. LIABILITY SHALL REST UPON THE PARTY USING OUR INFORMATION BEYOND THE ESTABLISHED LIMITATION ABOVE, IN WHICH CASE FREDERICK T. SEHER & ASSOCIATES, INC. DISAVOWS ANY AND ALL RESPONSIBILITY.

5. THAT ANY IMPROVEMENT CHANGES WITHIN THIS SITE OR THE ADJACENT SITE THEREOF AS WELL AS TITLE TRANSFERS OF THE PROPERTY IN QUESTION (EXCEPT FOR ALTA MAPS) AND/OR THE LAPSE OF 3 OR MORE YEARS FROM THE DATE OF THE MAP (WHICHEVER COMES FIRST) SHALL VOID ALL INFORMATION, HEREON UNLESS A RE-SURVEY IS ORDERED TO RECTIFY, UPDATE OR RE-CERTIFY THIS MAP.

6. THAT THIS INFORMATION SHALL NOT BE USED FOR ANY IMPROVEMENT STAKING UNLESS STATED IN ITEM NO. 3 ABOVE.

7. THAT THE USE OF THIS MAP BY OTHER CONSULTANTS OR CONTRACTORS ON BEHALF OF OUR CLIENT SHALL PROMPT THE IMMEDIATE FULFILLMENTS OF ALL CLIENT'S OBLIGATIONS TO FREDERICK T. SEHER & ASSOCIATES, INC. UNLESS OTHERWISE AGREED TO.

8. IT SHALL BE THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE PROPERTY OWNERS INVOLVED TO RESOLVE ALL ISSUES REGARDING PROPERTY DISPUTES WHICH MAY ARISE OUT OF INFORMATION SHOWN HEREON.

9. THIS MAP WILL BE PROVIDED IN AN ELECTRONIC FORMAT AS A COURTESY TO THE CLIENT. THE DELIVERY OF THE ELECTRONIC FILE DOES NOT CONSTITUTE THE DELIVERY OF OUR PROFESSIONAL WORK PRODUCT. A SIGNED PRINT DELIVERED TO THE CLIENT OR CLIENT REPRESENTATIVE CONSTITUTES OUR PROFESSIONAL WORK PRODUCT, AND IN THE EVENT THE ELECTRONIC FILE IS ALTERED, THE PRINT MUST BE REFERRED TO FOR THE ORIGINAL AND CORRECT SURVEY INFORMATION. WE SHALL NOT BE RESPONSIBLE FOR ANY MODIFICATIONS MADE TO THE ELECTRONIC FILE, OR FOR ANY PRODUCTS DERIVED FROM THE ELECTRONIC FILE WHICH ARE NOT REVIEWED, SIGNED AND SEALED BY US.



1' 0" 4' 8' 12' 16' 20' 24'

SCALE: 1/8" = 1'-0"

PRELIMINARY
FOR REVIEW PURPOSES
ONLY

BOUNDARY NOTES.

PROPERTY AND RIGHT-OF-WAY LINES SHOWN HEREON ARE PREDICATED ON AN ANALYSIS OF EXISTING IMPROVEMENTS, RECORD DATA, FIELD TIES AND ASSESSOR'S PARCEL MAPS. IT IS NOT THE INTENT OF THIS MAP TO PROVIDE A FORMAL BOUNDARY RESOLUTION FOR THE SUBJECT PROPERTY SHOWN HEREON. SAID RESOLUTION WOULD REQUIRE THE SETTING OF PROPERTY CORNERS AND THE FILING OF A RECORD OF SURVEY UNDER CALIFORNIA STATE LAW. BOUNDARY INFORMATION SHOWN HEREON IS FOR PLANNING PURPOSES ONLY.

ALL ANGLES ARE 90° UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED

ALL DISTANCES ARE MEASURED IN FEET AND DECIMALS THEREOF

DATE OF FIELD SURVEY:

TOPOGRAPHIC INFORMATION SHOWN HERE IS BASED UPON A FIELD SURVEY PERFORMED BY FREDERICK T. SEHER & ASSOCIATES INC. ON MAY 1, 2012.

SURVEY REFERENCE:

THE SURVEY HEREON IS BASED ON THE LEGAL DESCRIPTIONS DESCRIBED
IN THE FOLLOWING GRANT DEED:
LOTS 071 & 072; RECORDED OCTOBER 18, 2010, DOCUMENT NUMBER
2010-J065935-00, ON REEL K251 AT IMAGE 0024, PARCELS 1, 2, 3, 5 & 6.

UTILITY NOTE:

UNDERGROUND UTILITIES SHOWN HEREON WERE PLOTTED FROM A COMBINATION OF OBSERVED SURFACE EVIDENCE (CONDITIONS PERMITTING) AND RECORD INFORMATION OBTAINED FROM THE RESPECTIVE UTILITY COMPANIES, AND ARE NOT INTENDED TO REPRESENT THEIR ACTUAL LOCATIONS. THEREFORE, ALL UTILITIES MUST BE VERIFIED WITH RESPECT TO SIZES, HORIZONTAL AND VERTICAL LOCATIONS BY THE OWNER AND/OR CONTRACTOR PRIOR TO DESIGN OR CONSTRUCTION. NO RESPONSIBILITY IS ASSUMED BY THE SURVEYOR FOR THE LOCATION AND CAPACITY OF SAID UTILITIES.

PROJECT BENCHMARK - DESCRIPTION:

ELEVATIONS SHOWN HEREON WERE OBTAINED FROM A GROUP OF CITY BENCHMARKS, LOCATED AT THE INTERSECTION OF SECOND AND BRYANT STREETS. ELEVATIONS ARE BASED ON CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO DATUM. N.W. CORNER, CROW CUT OUTER RIM SW1. ELEVATION = 44.508'

GENERAL NOTE:

THE FOLIAGE LINES OF ALL TREES PLOTTED HEREON ARE SHOWN IN A GRAPHICAL FORM ONLY, AND ARE NOT INTENDED TO REPRESENT ACTUAL DRIPLINES THEREOF.

SURVEYOR'S STATEMENT:

THIS MAP WAS PREPARED BY ME, OR UNDER MY DIRECTION, AND IS BASED UPON A FIELD SURVEY.

FREDERICK T. SEHER, PLS
LICENSE NO. 6216
LICENSE EXPIRES MARCH 31, 2014

DATE

DATE: MAY, 2012
SCALE: 1" = 8'
DRAWN BY: DPL
DRAWING NAME: 1619-12
SURVEYED BY:
CHECKED BY:
CHECKED BY:



FREDERICK T. SEHER & ASSOCIATES, INC.
PROFESSIONAL LAND SURVEYORS
SURVEYING & MAPPING
841 LOMBARD STREET, SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94133
(415) 921-7690 FAX (415) 921-7655

ARCHITECTURAL SITE SURVEY
75 & 85 FEDERAL STREET
ASSESSOR'S BLOCK 3774, LOTS 071 & 072

SHEET

OF	1	SHEETS
FILE NO.		
1619-12		



Federal St. – Looking S.E. 100' Away



Federal St. – Looking E. 35' Away



Federal St. – Looking W. 35' Away



De Boom St. – Looking N.E. 80' Away



De Boom St. – Looking E. 35' Away



De Boom St. – Looking W. 35' Away



Looking Down Federal St. From 2nd St.



Looking Down De Boom St. From 2nd St.