Exhibit A to Draft Motion
Planning Department Response to Appeal of Preliminary Mitigated Negative Declaration

Planning Case No. 2016-006860ENV – 65 Ocean Avenue published on September 18, 2019

BACKGROUND

The project sponsor submitted an application (2016-006860ENV) for the proposed project at 65 Ocean Avenue on May 20, 2016 to demolish three existing buildings on the project site and construct an approximately 55-foot-tall building containing 193 dwelling units, a 5,952-gsf childcare facility, and basement-level garage with a total of 121 parking spaces. The building would contain approximately 190,215 gsf and would vary in height from four stories (40 feet) on Cayuga Avenue to five stories along Ocean Avenue to six stories (55 feet) on Alemany Boulevard. Vehicular access to and from the basement-level garage would be provided on Cayuga Avenue. Construction of the proposed project would occur over 25 months. The project site is in the Excelsior Outer Mission Street Neighborhood Commercial District (NCD) and a 40-X Height and Bulk District. The proposed project would require approval of a HOME-SF Project Authorization.

The San Francisco Planning Department (planning department) issued a preliminary mitigated negative declaration (PMND) for the proposed project on September 18, 2019.

APPEAL FILED

People Organizing to Demand Environmental & Economic Rights (PODER) (appellant) submitted by Antonio Diaz on October 8, 2019. A copy of the appeal letter is included with this appeal response packet.

PLANNING DEPARTMENT RESPONSES

The concerns raised in the appeal letter are addressed in the responses below.

Response 1: The PMND adequately addressed the 65 Ocean Avenue project’s compatibility with existing land use plans and policies.

The appellant asserts that the PMND is missing analysis of the project’s compatibility with existing land use plans and policies because it does not reference the Excelsior Outer Mission Neighborhood Strategy, which was convened by District Supervisor Ahsha Safai and facilitated by the San Francisco Planning Department (planning department) in 2017.
The Excelsior & Outer Mission Neighborhood Strategy (Excelsior Strategy) is not an adopted plan; it is a series of strategies developed by community members with the guidance of the planning department, the Mayor’s Office of Economic and Workforce Development, the Excelsior Action Group (EAG), and Supervisor Ahsha Safai’s office to improve and enhance the Excelsior, Outer Mission, Mission Terrace, Crocker Amazon, and Cayuga neighborhoods. The Excelsior Strategy was completed and published in November 2018.

The completion of the Excelsior Strategy has not resulted in an adopted plan or in legislation to amend the zoning controls for these neighborhoods. Because the Excelsior Strategy did not result in an adopted plan, CEQA does not require the PMND to discuss the proposed project’s compatibility with the strategies that were adopted in connection with the Excelsior Strategy. Instead, pursuant to the Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, the PMND was required to analyze the project’s potential to result in physical environmental impacts due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect. Land use impacts would be considered significant if the proposed project would conflict with any plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect. Environmental plans and policies are those that directly address environmental issues and/or contain targets or standards that must be met in order to preserve or improve characteristics of the City’s physical environment. Examples of such plans, policies, or regulations include the Bay Area Air Quality Management District’s 2017 Clean Air Plan and the San Francisco Regional Water Quality Control Board’s San Francisco Basin Plan. The proposed project would not substantially conflict with any plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect including Article 10 of the San Francisco Planning Code, the 2017 Clean Air Plan, San Francisco’s Strategies to Address Greenhouse Gas Emissions (GHG Reduction Strategy) and the San Francisco Urban Forestry Ordinance. The Excelsior & Outer Mission Neighborhood Strategy does not contain zoning or plans that the proposed project would conflict with, resulting in a physical environmental effect. The PMND determined that the project would result in a less-than-significant impact related to conflicts with land use plans, policies, or regulations.

Although CEQA does not require that the PMND discuss the project’s compatibility with the Excelsior Strategy, the planning department notes that the proposed project is generally consistent with Strategy LUH 1.1, which asks the City “to develop a corridor-wide housing plan for a range of income levels for both renters and homeowners.” The proposed project would provide a total of 193 dwelling units, including 48 below-market-rate units at varying levels of affordability (55, 80, and 110 percent of area median income). Furthermore, the Excelsior Strategy includes ideas such as “Encourage the use of existing density bonus programs, like Home SF…” and “Study a range of building height and density limits in the context of this neighborhood to allow more housing” and “Enable ‘life cycle housing’ so that someone can raise a family and find housing for their golden years without leaving the neighborhood.”

Response 2: The PMND adequately addressed the impacts of the proposed project, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects.
As stated in Section B, Project Setting, of the PMND, "the cumulative context for land use effects are typically localized, within the immediate vicinity of the project site, or at the neighborhood level." The project vicinity is defined as within approximately a quarter-mile radius of the project site. The analysis of cumulative impacts typically considers other proposed development projects that are within a quarter-mile radius of the project site. Cumulative development projects that are farther than a quarter-mile from a project site are often too far away to combine with a proposed project to result in cumulative impacts.

In the case of 65 Ocean Avenue, the cumulative context includes four cumulative development projects within a quarter-mile radius of the project site, which includes the following projects:

- Case No. 2015-001961ENV: 350 Ocean Avenue (construction of mixed-use building with 24 dwelling units, approximately 1,225 sf of commercial space, and 12 parking spaces)
- Case No. 2015-003791ENV: 203 Cotter Street (demolition of existing greenhouse and storage sheds and construction of a 15,400-sf private school (Golden Bridges school) serving kindergarten through eighth grade)¹
- Case No. 2016-012545ENV: 4840 Mission Street (construction of residential building with 134 dwelling units and 24 parking spaces)
- Case No. 2016-013850ENV: 915 Cayuga Avenue (demolition of existing building and construction of mixed-use building with 116 dwelling units, approximately 400 sf of commercial space, and 69 parking spaces)

For some topics, the cumulative context may be expanded to include a larger geographic area; for example the analysis of cumulative transportation impacts for 65 Ocean Avenue used a half-mile radius around the project site. This is because the project generated vehicle trips can combine with cumulative projects at a further distance than for environmental topics such as noise and vibration, which have more localized impacts.

The analysis of cumulative impacts for all environmental topics in the PMND is consistent with the standard approach used by the planning department. The appellant has provided no additional information or substantial evidence in the record that the project would cause cumulative impacts that were not already identified in the PMND.

The appellant states that the majority of units at nearby cumulative development projects represent higher-end development and cites an urban planning researcher's conclusion that such units would "reinforce the effects of income inequality rather than tempering them." Concerns have been raised in general throughout the City regarding the loss of middle-income jobs and affordable housing. Evidence of social or economic impacts (e.g., rising property values, increasing rents, changing neighborhood demographics) that do not contribute to, or are not caused by, physical impacts on the environment are

¹ The project site is currently home to the Golden Bridges school, and this school is proposing to relocate to 203 Cotter Street.
not substantial evidence of a significant effect on the environment. Social and economic effects are only relevant under CEQA if they would result in or are caused by an adverse physical impact on the environment. The appellant has not provided any specific examples of such impacts. Socioeconomic impacts are discussed further under Response 4.

The appellant also states "we believe that the cumulative impact of all this unplanned growth will result in substantial impacts ..." without providing any specific examples of adverse physical environmental impacts. As discussed in Section E.2, Population and Housing, Impact PH-1, of the PMND, the Association of Bay Area Governments has projected that San Francisco’s population will grow by 364,250 persons between 2010 and 2040. Implementation of the proposed housing project will help alleviate the demand for additional housing generated by this anticipated growth.

Response 3: The PMND adequately addressed the project and cumulative transportation impacts of the 65 Ocean Avenue project.

Regarding the appellant’s comment:

“We believe the PMND significantly underestimates the cumulative traffic impacts induced by the project. As a result of this project, we believe the project area will experience unforeseen changes in traffic patterns that have not yet been evaluated.

Given that prospective tenants in the proposed 65 Ocean development would likely have to earn two to three times the median household income in the district to rent one of the market-rate apartments in the building, it is safe to assume that the majority of residents will be upscale high-income earners. Studies have shown that higher income residents are higher users of rideshare transportation such as Lyft and Uber. Moreover, higher income residents are also known to have increased frequency of "amazon" deliveries, resulting in increased frequency of truck deliveries.”

The project’s transportation analysis in the PMND, including both project and cumulative level analysis, is based on the analysis, findings, and information contained in a transportation circulation memorandum and a supplemental memorandum prepared for the proposed project.  

Appellant suggests that there would be a higher demand of rideshare and deliveries by higher income residents. This statement is consistent with recent studies. However, even considering the potential for such higher usage of these services by higher income residents, the project’s transportation impact analysis of passenger and freight loading demand is still more conservative compared to the above noted recent trends.

The planning department used the most up-to-date transportation impact analysis guidelines assumptions at the time of the projects transportation analysis, which were the 2002 transportation impact analysis guidelines (TIA guidelines). Since the 65 Ocean Avenue project’s transportation analysis was completed for the 65 Ocean Avenue project, the department updated its TIA guidelines in February 2019.

---

2 Kittelson & Associates, 65 Ocean Avenue Transportation Circulation Memorandum, August 1, 2019.
The 2019 TIA guidelines estimated trip generation, mode split, and loading demand rates by land use type (residential, office, retail, and hotel) and land use context place type (urban high density, urban medium density, and urban low density) based on intercept surveys of 65 San Francisco sites in 2016 and 2017. The planning department conducted these intercept surveys at sites with newer construction market rate buildings that reflected different demographics and travel behaviors than found in older buildings in the same neighborhood. For example, an intercept survey was conducted at the newer 1150 Ocean Avenue building, which is approximately one mile from the project site.

Table 1 below compares the estimated project travel demand based on the 2002 TIA guidelines and the 2019 TIA guidelines. The project’s estimated passenger loading (based on the 2019 TIA guidelines), including TNC passenger loading instances during the afternoon peak hour, would still be lower than the estimated number of passenger loading instances in the project’s transportation impact analysis (based on the 2002 TIA guidelines). While the estimated daily freight loading instances would remain the same between the 2002 and 2019 TIA guidelines, according to a planning department survey of residential sites during the mid-day period (peak period for deliveries in San Francisco) conducted in the summer of 2019, 50-55% of freight deliveries are serviced by personal vehicles or smaller delivery vans that are relatively similar in length to personal motorized vehicles (approximately 20 feet). Therefore, the 65 Ocean Avenue transportation circulation memo estimated 33 passenger loading instances during the PM peak hour (based on the 2002 TIA guidelines), which would more than account for both deliveries by these smaller vehicles and TNC passenger loading as estimated by the 2019 TIA guidelines.

Table 1 - 65 Ocean Avenue: 2002 TIA Guidelines Travel Demand vs. 2019 TIA Guidelines Travel Demand

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2002 TIA Guidelines</th>
<th>2019 TIA Guidelines</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daily person trips</td>
<td>1,929</td>
<td>1,740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily vehicle trips</td>
<td>599</td>
<td>497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily freight loading instances</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM peak hour person trips</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM peak hour vehicle trips</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM peak hour passenger loading instances*</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The 2002 TIA Guidelines estimates conservatively assumed all other trips (not auto, walking or transit) were passenger loading trips. The 2019 TIA Guidelines estimates were based on observed data.

As shown in the project’s transportation impact analysis (Table 13 page 42), 33 passenger loading instances would translate to an estimated demand for two passenger loading spaces during the afternoon peak hour (3:00 to 6:00 p.m.). The project proposes a 44-foot passenger loading zone (accommodating approximately two vehicle loading spaces) along its Alemany Boulevard frontage, and would therefore meet the estimated demand. As discussed in the project’s transportation impact analysis (page 72), with buildout of the adjacent 915 Cayuga Avenue project (which would generate an estimated nine afternoon peak hour passenger loading instance) the cumulative projects would continue to meet their estimated passenger loading demand since 915 Cayuga Avenue also proposes a 66-foot (accommodating
approximately three vehicle loading spaces) dual use passenger-freight loading zone also along its Alemany Boulevard frontage.

As discussed in the proposed project’s transportation impact analysis (page 57), 5.3 freight loading instances would translate to an estimated demand for one freight loading space during the afternoon peak hour (3:00 to 6:00 p.m.). This estimated freight loading demand would be met by the project’s proposed off-street loading space in the parking garage designed for a 20-foot box truck. As discussed in the project’s transportation impact analysis (page 72), with buildout of the adjacent 915 Cayuga Avenue project (which would generate one peak hour freight loading instance) the cumulative projects would continue to meet their estimated freight loading demand since 915 Cayuga Avenue also proposes a 66-foot (approximately three vehicle loading spaces) dual use passenger-freight loading zone along its Alemany Boulevard frontage.

Regarding the appellant’s comment:

“Likewise, as has been seen in other parts of the City, Tech Shuttles, are likely predicted to come to the Excelsior, causing significant impact, as demonstrated by the Anti Eviction Mapping Project which has documented the connection between shuttle stops and higher incidences of no-fault evictions. The cumulative impact of these traffic impacts have not been properly studied and the project should therefore be sent back so that Planning can conduct a due diligence review of these impacts as directed in CEQA.”

The project’s transportation impact analysis uses the 2002 TIA guidelines, which included shuttle person daily trips within “Other Modes,” along with trips taken by bicycles and TNCs. As shown in the Table 2 below, the 2019 TIA guidelines have broken out private shuttle trips, bicycle, and TNC daily trips; however, the summation of these “Other Modes” trips would still be lower than the projects combined daily “Other Modes” trips stated in the transportation impact analysis. Therefore, the project has effectively evaluated travel demand of private shuttle trips.

Table 2 - 65 Ocean Avenue: Travel Mode

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Auto</td>
<td>1106</td>
<td>766</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>454</td>
<td>312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (including private shuttle, bike, TNC)</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Shuttle</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TNC/Taxi</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Furthermore, the environmental effects of SFMTA's commuter shuttle program was evaluated for environmental impacts in 2015. The environmental review determined that the commuter shuttle program would not result in any significant environmental effects from implementation of that program, including to transportation and circulation.

Regarding the appellant's comment:

"Moreover, the cumulative impact of these traffic changes are compounded when taking account of the other projects within the project vicinity, such as the 113 unit development under construction at 915 Cayuga next door.

There is a great potential for significant traffic impacts as a result of these cumulative impacts and they must therefore be studied. The cumulative traffic impact and increased vehicle miles traveled will likely cause more cars, more traffic, and increase the rate of pedestrian injuries."

The project's transportation impact analysis evaluated the cumulative transportation impact of the project with the adjacent 915 Cayuga project, and included evaluation of the project's cumulative safety hazards to people walking. As discussed on page 40 of the PMND, the proposed project and the adjacent 915 Cayuga project's garage door and driveway would be designed to reduce wait time and ingress/egress time with priority given to pedestrians, thus minimizing pedestrian hazards related to queuing of inbound vehicles on Cayuga Avenue. The proposed project and the adjacent 915 Cayuga project have been designed to include design features such as visual warning device at the project driveway to alert people walking when the garage door is in operation, and an interior queuing area just inside the garage door so that outbound vehicles can wait without blocking the sidewalk. The proposed project, in combination with cumulative projects, would not create potentially hazardous conditions for people walking and the PMND determined that the cumulative impact would be less-than-significant.

The appellant has provided no substantial evidence to support the assertion the proposed project would result in a cumulative transportation impact. The PMND has however provided substantial evidence to support the determination that cumulative transportation impacts would be less-than-significant.

Response 4: The PMND adequately addressed the population and housing impacts of the 65 Ocean Avenue project.

Socioeconomic and Displacement Impacts

The appellant asserts that the proposed project at 65 Ocean Avenue would result in socioeconomic pressures on the Excelsior and Outer Mission neighborhoods because the project would result in a high proportion of market rate units. The appellants also states that the existing neighborhood has a high proportion of family and multigenerational households living in overcrowded conditions, and that the proposed project would exacerbate those current conditions. The proposed project would construct 193 dwelling units, including 47 studios, 60 one-bedroom units, eight one-bedroom plus den, 57 two-bedroom units, and 21 three-bedroom units. Family sized units are considered two-bedroom units and above, therefore, the project would construct 78 family sized units. This is contrary to the nine family

4 Case Number 2015-007975ENV – SFMTA commuter shuttle program
sized units that the appellant claims the project would provide. The proposed project is also seeking modifications to the Planning Code requirements applicable to the project site for rear yard, usable open space, and dwelling unit exposure as well as two height bonuses in exchange for providing 48 dwelling units (25 percent of 193 dwelling units) that would be affordable to low-, middle-, and moderate-income households.

Under CEQA, socioeconomic effects may be considered only to the extent that a link can be established between anticipated socioeconomic effects of a proposed action and adverse physical environmental impacts. The Initial Study and PMND analysis has considered and not identified any adverse physical environmental effects due to the project's population and housing impacts. The proposed project would not result in any direct displacement of housing or people. Additionally, the demolition the building containing the Golden Bridges School would not displace employees because Golden Bridges School would relocate to a site in the project vicinity.

There is no substantial evidence in the record, or additional information provided by the appellant, indicating that the project would cause adverse physical environmental impacts due to gentrification and displacement of existing residents and businesses. The department recognizes that the Excelsior and Outer Mission neighborhoods are undergoing socioeconomic changes that are affecting existing residents, local small businesses, employment, and the character of the community. Recognizing that CEQA is not an effective or appropriate tool for managing the socioeconomic changes affecting the Excelsior and Outer Mission neighborhoods and other San Francisco neighborhoods, the Department is devoting resources outside of the CEQA process towards this end. The Department is working with the community, Planning Commission, elected leaders, and City partners to undertake a series of policy and implementation efforts aimed at addressing socioeconomic issues. The Planning Department is working on a Community Stabilization Strategy to undertake a broader analysis of displacement and gentrification issues citywide with a focus on equity working with UC Berkeley's Urban Displacement Project. City staff acknowledges that such an analysis is beyond the scope of environmental review under CEQA, but wish to inform decision-makers and the public that the department is working to address the socioeconomic issues of affordability, economic displacement, and gentrification through land use planning and policy efforts.

In addition, in order to inform its responses to two previous CEQA appeals, the Department undertook an analysis of gentrification and displacement citywide to determine whether individual projects contribute to gentrification and displacement and whether either of these phenomena directly or indirectly result in physical environmental effects prepared for the 2675 Folsom Street CEQA appeal. This information was undertaken for a project in the Mission district however, the results apply citywide. The planning department worked with ALH Urban & Regional Economics to prepare two analyses of retail supply and demand, commercial and residential displacement, as well as a review of the relevant academic literature to evaluate whether gentrification and displacement of existing residents or businesses can be attributed to the construction of market-rate residential and mixed-use development.

---


under the Eastern Neighborhoods rezoning and area plans. Neither these analyses nor the literature reviewed provides empirical evidence supporting the position that market-rate development is responsible for residential or commercial displacement (see Attachment A and Attachment B for the ALH technical studies). Based on the available data and expert opinion presented in the academic literature, it appears that the fundamental causes of gentrification and displacement in San Francisco are likely related to broader economic and social trends, such as the mismatch between the supply and demand for housing at all levels, the strength of the regional economy, low unemployment, high wages, favorable climate, and a preference for urban lifestyles and shorter commutes.

Displacement of Childcare Space

The appellant also asserts that the project would displace childcare space at the project site, and would result in an unmet demand for childcare spaces in the neighborhood. The PMND acknowledges that the project site currently contains two unoccupied buildings, and a third building which is occupied by the Golden Bridges School. The Golden Bridges School is proposing to relocate to 203 Cotter Street (Case No. 2015-003791ENV) following construction of a new school building at that site. Additionally, the Little Bear School, which previously occupied one of the other currently unoccupied buildings on the project site, has already relocated to 327 Capitol Avenue. The proposed project includes a 5,952-gross-square-foot (gsf) childcare facility that would serve 25 children. Therefore, even though the proposed project would remove an existing childcare from the project site, there is evidence that this childcare facility is relocating within the neighborhood, and the project is proposing to provide an additional on-site childcare. For these reasons, implementation of the proposed project would not result in a substantial unmet demand for childcare facilities and would not require the construction of new or alteration of existing school facilities.

CONCLUSION

For all of the reasons provided in this appeal response, department staff respectfully recommends that the commission deny the appeal of the CEQA determination. The appellant has not provided substantial evidence supporting a fair argument that the project would have significant impacts on the environment with implementation of feasible mitigation measures identified in the PMND that would warrant preparation of an environmental impact report (EIR).
65 OCEAN AVENUE

APPEAL OF PRELIMINARY MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION
Project Overview

- 40,497-sf (0.9-acre) project site
- Demolition and new construction
- 193 dwelling units
  - Studio, 1BR, 2BR, 3BR units
  - 48 below-market-rate units (25 percent)
- 5,942-sf childcare facility
- Below-grade parking garage
Primary Appeal Concerns

- Adequacy of Preliminary Mitigated Negative Declaration's:
  - Discussion of project compatibility with existing zoning and plans
  - Cumulative impacts analysis
  - Transportation analysis
  - Population and housing impacts analysis
PMND discussed project compatibility with existing zoning controls and adopted plans.

- Excelsior Strategy is not an adopted plan.
  - Project is generally consistent with Strategy LUH 1.1.
  - 48 BMR units at 55, 80, and 110 percent of area median income.
Analysis of Cumulative Impacts

- Analysis considered projects within a quarter-mile radius of the project site
  - Consistent with the Planning Department’s standard approach
  - Transportation analysis used a half-mile radius
Analysis of Transportation Impacts

- Transportation analysis used the latest guidelines available
  - More conservative than 2019 guidelines
- 915 Cayuga Avenue was included in cumulative impacts analysis
Analysis of Population and Housing Impacts

- Socioeconomic effects are not physical environmental impacts
  - No substantial evidence of link

- Displacement of on-site childcare facilities
  - One facility has relocated (327 Capitol Avenue)
  - One facility will be relocating (203 Cotter Avenue)
  - New on-site facility
Conclusion

- PMND adequately discussed or analyzed:
  - Project compatibility with existing zoning and plans
  - Cumulative impacts
  - Transportation impacts
  - Population and housing impacts

- No substantial evidence supporting a fair argument of significant impacts
Site Overview
65 Ocean Avenue is truly a product of the District 11 / Outer Mission & Excelsior community. Since 2016, PBV has listened to the needs of residents, neighborhood associations, community groups, non-profits, merchants and other stakeholders to inform the project. The following is a growing list of the various groups that we have communicated with, in addition to hundreds of individual neighbors:

- Excelsior Action Group
- Excelsior District Improvement Association
- New Mission Terrace Improvements Association
- Golden Bridges School
- Little Bear School
- Excelsior and Outer Mission Neighborhood Strategy Group
- Friends of Persia Triangle
- The Crayon Box
- Balboa High School
- SF Housing Action Coalition
- FACES SF
- Bay Area Council
- Youth Art Exchange
- Mission Hiring Hall
- Local 261, 38, 6, 104 and 483
- Outer Mission Merchants & Residents
- Excelsior Works!
- Mission Street Merchants
- Art for AIDS

3+ Years of Community Outreach

50+ Community Discussions

800+ Resident & Merchant Letters of Support and Change.org signatures
COMMUNITY ORIENTED RESULTS

- **193**
  - Brand new multifamily units

- **41%**
  - 2/3 br family sized units

- **25%**
  - BMR

- **7,300sf**
  - Childcare facility

- **500+**
  - Union jobs

- **30+**
  - Long-term jobs

- **9.6 MWh**
  - Monthly rooftop solar generation

- **$5.7mm**
  - Impact fees

- **$120mm**
  - Neighborhood investment

---

Of the 25% BMR units, up to 40% can be set aside specifically for District 11 residents
Less than 2% of structures in District 11 feature 20+ units
(compared to 26% citywide)
The project is located within 0.5 miles of the Balboa Park BART Station – one of the most heavily trafficked stops in the entire BART system which also serves as a stop for the above-ground MUNI system's J, K and M lines. Further, the site is well served by multiple bus lines including the 49, 29, 43, 8, 14, 14X and 14R. Finally, the site is also 0.5 miles away from the I-280 onramp serving vehicular access to the South Bay.
Existing preschool structures. Sponsor will be bringing back 7,300sf of childcare into the new project at its sole cost and expense.

65 Ocean will bring together historic residential and educational uses into a single, high-density development.

- **Residential Homes**
  - 1900
  - 1915

- **Neighborhood Market**
  - 1953

- **The Crayon Box Preschool**
  - 2001
  - 2006

- **Additional Residential Homes**
  - 2001

- **Discovery Center Early Education**
  - 2016

- **Little Bear Preschool**
  - 2022

- **Residential Homes and The Crayon Box Preschool**
  - 2022
## Project Evolution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Height Limit</th>
<th>HOME-SF+ (2019)</th>
<th>HOME-SF</th>
<th>ORIGINAL (2016)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50' Alemany &amp; 40' Cayuga</td>
<td>50' Alemany &amp; 40' Cayuga</td>
<td>40'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMR Rate</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit Count</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMR Count</td>
<td><strong>48</strong></td>
<td><strong>48</strong></td>
<td><strong>18</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55% AMI</td>
<td>19 / 10%</td>
<td>19 / 10%</td>
<td>10 / 10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80% AMI</td>
<td>15 / 8%</td>
<td>15 / 8%</td>
<td>4 / 4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110% AMI</td>
<td>14 / 7%</td>
<td>14 / 7%</td>
<td>4 / 4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studios</td>
<td>47 / 24%</td>
<td>52 / 27%</td>
<td>54 / 51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-BR</td>
<td>59 / 31%</td>
<td>81 / 43%</td>
<td>27 / 26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-BR + Den</td>
<td>8 / 4%</td>
<td>0 / 0%</td>
<td>0 / 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-BR</td>
<td>57 / 30%</td>
<td>42 / 21%</td>
<td>23 / 22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-BR</td>
<td>22 / 11%</td>
<td>18 / 9%</td>
<td>1 / 1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Proposed unit mix provides 41% two and three bedroom units geared towards families
- PBV is voluntarily providing a set-back along Cayuga Avenue at the request of the community to scale down the building – willingly sacrificing density to cater to neighborhood design
- 65 Ocean will increase the available BMR stock in District 11 by 145%
COMMUNITY-desired Setback
## Home-SF Development Pipeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit Count</th>
<th>BMR Count</th>
<th>Height</th>
<th>Parking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>921 O'Farrell</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Not Available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3945 Judah</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Required Off-street Parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3330 Geary</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>Not Available</td>
<td>Not Available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2601 Van Ness</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Not Available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 Ocean Ave</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>Rear Yard, Open Space, Exposure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3333 San Bruno</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Not Available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>999 Texas</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Not Available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4110 Geary Blvd</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Not Available</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- 65 Ocean Avenue is the largest HOME-SF project by over 3x and the only one in District 11.
- Other HOME-SF projects still have several more years of approvals and permit processing before they break ground.

Source: Planning Department Housing Report, 2018
There have been no 100% affordable housing projects built in District 11 in the past 20 years.

District 9, which has been the focus of resident displacement in recent years, has produced an average of 44 BMR units across 6 developments in the last 20 years.

65 Ocean Avenue, on its own, provides 48 BMR units within a privately financed market rate development.
The Crayon Box

- 65 Ocean is the first project to provide a dedicated onsite child care facility instead simply paying into the San Francisco Childcare Impact Fee Fund.

  - Paying into the fund would only generate ~$400,000 into that may not service District 11
  - PBV is financing over $2,500,000 in core/shell and tenant improvements

- 65 Ocean Avenue is providing 5,183 square feet of indoor classroom space and 2,129 square feet of private open-space that will serve up to 75 children

- Dedicated parent loading zone drop area on Alemany Boulevard

- 15-year lease term at below market rates to the Crayon Box – former tenant and local Outer Mission business
**Affordable and Accessible Family Housing**

- Permanently affordable and accessible Housing for 1 in 4 tenants

- Multilingual workshops to assist with applications for affordable units – PBV will ensure that local residents have the resources to complete multilingual applications correctly and completely

- The project has introduced a new unit typology – a 1-bedroom plus den that can double as a potential living room. Further, approximately 6,000 NSF has been added to the project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aug '19</th>
<th>% of Mix</th>
<th>SF</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0x1</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1x1</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1x1 + Den</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2x2</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>796</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3x2</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>1,015</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total / Ave</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>592</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sept '19</th>
<th>% of Mix</th>
<th>SF</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Count △</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0x1</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1x1</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>562</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>(22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1x1 + Den</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>630</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2x2</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>763</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3x2</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>986</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total / Ave</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>625</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
JOB CREATION

- 65 Ocean will be built using 100% union labor and will employ approximately 500 construction workers across all disciplines throughout the course of the project.

- We have signed a Memorandum of Understanding with the Laborers (Local 261), Plumbers & Steamfitters (Local 38), IBEW (Local 6), Sheet Metal Workers (Local 104) and Sprinkler Fitters (Local 483), and Carpenters (Local 22).

- Mission Hiring Hall will assist in hiring at-risk individuals for jobs during and after construction.

- 65 Ocean will also employ up to 5 full-time employees on-site for property management, maintenance and engineering purposes.

- The Crayon Box will employ between 15-30 various full/part time roles.
65 Ocean Community Benefits

- 25% Affordable Housing
- 41% Family Oriented Units
- Transit Equity
- On-Site Spanish Immersion Childcare
- Union Job Creation
- Impact Fee Contribution
- Sustainability
- Stormwater Management
- Parking
- Streetscape Improvement
- Public Art Program
- Future-proof Development
65 Ocean
THANK YOU

PRESIDIO BAY VENTURES
1160 BATTERY ST, SUITE 250
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111
WWW.PRESIDIOBAY.COM
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Presidio Bay Residential Portfolio
PBV is planning to invest $500mm towards the development of housing throughout San Francisco, and will invest an additional $120mm to build 65 Ocean Avenue. We are dedicated to providing quality housing and contributing towards each district in the City.
MATERIALS
Project Data Sheets
PROJECT INFORMATION

■ UNITS
  - RESIDENTIAL 193 UNITS, 59 X 1 BEDROOMS; 8 X 1 BEDROOMS + DEN; 57 X 2 BEDROOMS;
  - STORAGE/PARKING 22 X 3 BEDROOMS; 47 X STUDIOS
  - CHILD CARE GARAGE
  - GROUND FLOOR

■ LOT SIZE 40,497 SF

■ HEIGHT 54'-7" TALL (54'-7" HEIGHT LIMIT PER HOME-SF)

■ PARKING
  - TOTAL 121
  - RESIDENTIAL PARKING 117
  - RESIDENTIAL MOTORCYCLE 1
  - CAR SHARE 2
  - CHILD CARE PARKING 1
  - BIKE PARKING
    - RESIDENTIAL: 147 CLASS 1; 20 CLASS 2
    - CHILD CARE: 2 CLASS 1; 2 CLASS 2

■ REAR YARD 8,683 SF (21.4 %)

■ OPEN SPACE
  - COMMON 17,408 SF

■ ACCESSIBILITY CBC SEC. 1134A, BATHING AND TOILET FACILITIES: PROJECT CONFORMS W/ OPTION 2 COMPLIANCE.

■ AFFORDABILITY 25%

■ CONSTRUCTION TYPE TYPE-IIIA WOOD FRAMED CONSTRUCTION OVER TYPE-1A: CONCRETE PODIUM (S-2, R-2 & E)
SCOPE OF WORK

THE PROPOSED PROJECT WOULD INCLUDE DEMOLITION OF (3) EXISTING TWO STORY AND (1) ONE-STORY COMMERCIAL BUILDING ON A THROUGH LOT AND CONSTRUCTION OF A 3-6 STORY OVER GARAGE, 54'-7" TALL MAXIMUM HEIGHT, 191,374 SQUARE FOOT RESIDENTIAL APARTMENT BUILDING. THE NEW BUILDING WOULD INCLUDE A TOTAL OF 193 DWELLING UNITS, 5,942 SQUARE FEET OF GROUND FLOOR CHILD CARE FACILITY, AND 121 PARKING SPACES IN A BELOW GRADE PARKING GARAGE.

SPECIAL USE DISTRICT

EXCELSIOR OUTER MISSION SUD

MODIFICATIONS REQUIRED:
REAR YARD MODIFICATION SEC.134, DWELLING UNIT EXPOSURE MODIFICATION SEC.140(a)(1), USABLE OPEN SPACE MODIFICATION SEC. 135 AND INNER COURT AS OPEN SPACE SEC. 135 PER HOME-SF

GROSS AREA & UNIT MIX CALCULATIONS

GROSS EXTERIOR CALCULATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FLOOR (STORY)</th>
<th>AREA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GARAGE -10'</td>
<td>39,501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GROUND Floor -0'</td>
<td>27,966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2ND FLOOR +10'</td>
<td>29,880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3RD FLOOR +20'</td>
<td>31,354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4TH FLOOR +30'</td>
<td>26,302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5TH FLOOR +40'</td>
<td>17,671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6TH FLOOR +50'</td>
<td>17,785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROOF +60'</td>
<td>717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>191,374 sq ft</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

UNIT MIX CALCULATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNIT MIX</th>
<th>QUANTITY</th>
<th>UNIT MIX %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 BD</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>32 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 BD + DEN</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 BD</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>29 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 BD</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STUDIO</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>24 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>193</td>
<td>100 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BUILDING GFA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AREA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RESIDENTIAL</td>
<td>= 154,381 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHILD CARE</td>
<td>= 5,942 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALLOWED DEDUCTIONS</td>
<td>= 31,051 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARKING</td>
<td>= 27,254 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIKE PARKING</td>
<td>= 1,323 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SERVICE UTILTY IN BASEMENT</td>
<td>872 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROOF STAIR/Mech Bulkhead</td>
<td>1,426 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAY WINDOW DEDUCTIONS</td>
<td>= 176 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GFA TOTAL WITH DEDUCTIONS</strong></td>
<td>191,374 SF - 31,051 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GFA TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>= 160,323 SF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BUILDING AREA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BUILDING AREA</th>
<th>GROSS AREA (SQ FT)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AMENITIES/LOBBY</td>
<td>5,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHILD CARE</td>
<td>5,588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHILD CARE LOBBY</td>
<td>554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIRCULATION</td>
<td>17,463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARKING</td>
<td>28,577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESIDENTIAL</td>
<td>129,906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESIDENTIAL STORAGE</td>
<td>1,514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UTILITY</td>
<td>1,973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>191,374 sq ft</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Area Calculations: Common Open Space

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FLOOR (STORY)</th>
<th>Measured Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GROUND Floor -0'</td>
<td>8,340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4TH FLOOR +30'</td>
<td>3,429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5TH FLOOR +40'</td>
<td>5,639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>17,408 sq ft</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Child Care Open Space is included in the Total Open Space Calculations

Area Calculations: Rear Yard

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FLOOR (STORY)</th>
<th>AREA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GROUND Floor -0'</td>
<td>8,683</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>8,683 sq ft (21.4%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### PLANNING CODE SUMMARY

#### 65 OCEAN AVE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SECTION</th>
<th>REFERENCE</th>
<th>NOTE/REQUIRED</th>
<th>PROPOSED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ASSESSORS BLOCK</td>
<td>Map</td>
<td>65/4018</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SITE AREA</td>
<td>Map</td>
<td>40.41 ft² (0.376 Acres)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZONING DISTRICT</td>
<td>ZH11</td>
<td>NOC-Excessor Outer Mission</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEIGHT</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>40'-4&quot;/5'3&quot; per HOME-GF</td>
<td>54'-7&quot; added to HOME-GF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPECIAL HIGH DISTRICT (SHD)</td>
<td>229.6</td>
<td>Seconds Streets SSD</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLOPE OF 50% OR GREATER</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Subject to provisions of Health Code Article 22A, amended by DPW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAHER ORDINANCE</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### BUILDING CODE SUMMARY

- **CONSTRUCTION TYPE:** TYPE-IIA WOOD FRAMED CONSTRUCTION OVER TYPE-IA: CONCRETE PODIUM (S-2, R-2 & E)
- **OCCUPANT GROUP:** R-2: RESIDENTIAL BASEMENT TO 6TH FLOOR S-2: STORAGE/PARKING: GARAGE PLAN E: CHILD CARE: GROUND FLOOR
- **SPRINKLERS:** NFPA 13 AUTOMATIC FIRE SPRINKLERS TO BE PROVIDED THROUGHOUT ENTIRE BLDG.
- **BLDG. HT. & NUMBER OF STORIES:**
  - ALLOWED: BLDG. HT: 54'-7" STORIES: MAXIMUM 4 1/2 - INCLUDING 4-5 STORIES OF TYPE VA OR IIIA (R-2) OVER 1-2 STORY OR BASEMENT TYPE IA (S-2, E)
  - PROPOSED: BLDG. HT: 54'-7" STORIES: VARIES 4-6 - INCLUDING 4-5 STORIES MAXIMUM OF TYPE VA OR IIIA (R-2) OVER 1-2 STORY OR BASEMENT TYPE IA (S-2, E)
- **ACCESSIBLE ELEVATOR:** BUILDING IS A COVERED MULTIFAMILY DWELLING WITH AN ELEVATOR THAT MEETS THE CH. 11A REQUIREMENTS
- **ACCESSIBILITY:** CBC SEC. 1134A, BATHING AND TOILET FACILITIES: PROJECT CONFORMS W/ OPTION 2 COMPLIANCE.
- **DEFERRED SUBMITTALS:** SPRINKLER SYSTEM IS UNDER SEPARATE PERMIT

#### CODE SUMMARY

- 2016 CALIFORNIA BUILDING CODE
- 2016 CALIFORNIA ELECTRICAL CODE
- 2016 CALIFORNIA MECHANICAL CODE
- 2016 CALIFORNIA PLUMBING CODE
- 2016 CALIFORNIA FIRE CODE
Site Plan
Open Space
Floorplans
Elevations
Nested bedroom study
1 BEDROOM NESTED, STANDARD 1 BED (UNIT 311 STACKED)
PRESIDIO BAY VENTURES

2 BEDROOM NESTED - 2nd BEDROOM NO QUALIFYING WINDOW PROPERTY-LINE (STACKED UNIT 305)

rg-architecture
65 Ocean Avenue
10/2/19

2 Bedroom Nested
AMI Study
Income Threshold: This is the maximum income that a household can earn in order to qualify for a certain AMI level. For example, a one-person household earning $47,400 or less will qualify for the 55% AMI rent controlled units. However, if there are three people in the family, the household can earn $60,950 or less and still qualify for the 55% AMI rent controlled units. The city does not distinguish between family members and earners.

Household: This is a description of common households. We have chosen to focus on the following:

- Single-earner (Studio)
- Married couple with one infant — one full-time earner and one part time earner (Studio or 1-BR)
- Married couple with two children — both parents are full-time earners (2-BR)
- Married couple, two children, two seniors — both parents are full-time earners with the elder child working part-time (3-BR)

Wages: This is an estimate of how much the household can expect to earn. For the 55% AMI level we have assumed minimum wage salary working 40 hours per week for 51 weeks out of the year

Monthly Rent: This is the monthly rent by unit type as prescribed by the San Francisco Mayor's Office of Housing. 65 Ocean does not control the rents that we are allowed to charge to the BMR tenants.

% of Income: This shows the proportion of the household annual income that is paid in rent, depending on the household size and earner profile. For every unit type and household size except for a single-earner, the amount of rent as a percentage of income is 30% or less, which is line with CUHJ's measure of affordability.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Threshold</th>
<th>Household</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Wages</th>
<th>Monthly Rent</th>
<th>% of Income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$47,400</td>
<td>1x Full Time</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>$31,804</td>
<td>$1,026</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$60,950</td>
<td>1x Full Time 1x Part Time 1x Infant</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>$47,705</td>
<td>$1,026</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$60,950</td>
<td>1x Full Time 1x Part Time 1x Infant</td>
<td>1-BR</td>
<td>$47,705</td>
<td>$1,182</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$67,750</td>
<td>2x Full Time 2x Children</td>
<td>2-BR</td>
<td>$63,607</td>
<td>$1,286</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$78,550</td>
<td>2x Full Time 1x Part Time 2x Seniors 1x Infant</td>
<td>3-BR</td>
<td>$71,558</td>
<td>$1,391</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Full time earner for 55% AMI assumes SF minimum wage of $15.59/hr working 40 hours per week for 51 weeks in the year
# 80% AMI Family Profiles & Rent Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Threshold</th>
<th>Household</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Wages</th>
<th>Monthly Rent</th>
<th>% of Income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$68,950</td>
<td>1x Full Time</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>$67,450</td>
<td>$1,565</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$88,700</td>
<td>1x Full Time, 1x Part Time, 1x Infant</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>$87,200</td>
<td>$1,565</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$88,700</td>
<td>1x Full Time, 1x Part Time, 1x Infant</td>
<td>1-BR</td>
<td>$87,200</td>
<td>$1,797</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$98,500</td>
<td>2x Full Time, 2x Children</td>
<td>2-BR</td>
<td>$97,000</td>
<td>$1,980</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$114,300</td>
<td>2x Full Time, 1x Part Time, 2x Seniors, 1x Infant</td>
<td>3-BR</td>
<td>$112,800</td>
<td>$2,158</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 110% AMI Family Profiles & Rent Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Threshold</th>
<th>Household</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Wages</th>
<th>Monthly Rent</th>
<th>% of Income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$108,350</td>
<td>1x Full Time</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>$106,850</td>
<td>$2,211</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$121,950</td>
<td>1x Full Time</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>$120,450</td>
<td>$2,211</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1x Part Time 1x Infant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$121,950</td>
<td>1x Full Time</td>
<td>1-BR</td>
<td>$120,450</td>
<td>$2,647</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1x Part Time 1x Infant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$135,450</td>
<td>2x Full Time 2x Children</td>
<td>2-BR</td>
<td>$133,950</td>
<td>$2,811</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$157,150</td>
<td>2x Full Time</td>
<td>3-BR</td>
<td>$155,650</td>
<td>$3,306</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1x Part Time 2x Seniors 1x Infant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IMPACT FEES
### Impact Fees and In-Kind Investment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact &amp; Infrastructure Fees</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco Unified School District Fee</td>
<td>$581,124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Sustainability Fee</td>
<td>1,411,282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020 Impact Fee Escalation</td>
<td>119,544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF DBI Plan Review Fees</td>
<td>226,879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF DBI Permit Issuance Fee</td>
<td>64,774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Capacity Change - 6&quot; Meter</td>
<td>84,433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wastewater Capacity Change - 10&quot; Meter</td>
<td>591,015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact &amp; Infrastructure Fees</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,079,051</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Childcare Improvements</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,681,627</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total** $5,760,678

- Impact fees and in-kind investments into the childcare facility total over 5% of the total project cost
Project schedule
# Project Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Milestone</th>
<th>Est. Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning Commission Hearing</td>
<td>October 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submit Permit Applications to SF DBI</td>
<td>November 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity Zone Capitalization Deadline</td>
<td>December 31st, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Permit Approval &amp; Execution of GMP</td>
<td>June 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close on Construction Financing</td>
<td>July 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobilize Construction Team and Commence Demolition / Excavation</td>
<td>August 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End of Construction</td>
<td>March 2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issuance of Temporary Certificate of Occupancy</td>
<td>April 2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lease-Up of Property</td>
<td>November 2022</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1. INTRODUCTION
• Implement 2018 Project Approvals
  Allowed flexibility, including transfer of office from Shipyard to Candlestick

• Planning for Success at Candlestick Center
  Right-size retail, more housing, more office

• Create Jobs
  Increase range of opportunities and economic relevance

• Build Housing Sooner

• This Design for Development update reflects new program proposed for Candlestick Center
2. GUIDING PRINCIPLES
Guiding Principles

Viewsheds:
Preserving & Enhancing Views
Guiding Principles

Landmarks:
Distinctive Urban Elements

- Gateway - community entry points
- Landmark - significant building or feature
- Focal Point - focus of activity and interest
Guiding Principles

Open Space:
Surrounded by Nature

Preserved and enhanced open space along waterfront
Typical trail with view of Hunter's Point beyond
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Guiding Principles

Connectivity:
Existing Street Grids and Transit

Greater blocks and active frontages encourage walking.

Driveways connect to major entertainment and open space destinations.
Guiding Principles

Transit Network:
Getting Around

Typical BRT ticketing and platform

Gabby Street dedicated BRT lane and shelter
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Guiding Principles

Street Hierarchy:
A Variety of Street Types
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• 2016 D4D Amendment proposed 80’ heights for the main edges of Candlestick Center, and 65’ for the middle section.

• The Landmark Building was proposed at 120’ height.
• 2019 D4D Amendment proposes 85' heights for most of Candlestick Center.

• The Signature Building maintains the previous 120' height in 2016 D4D.

• The proposed Office Buildings along Arellious Walker Drive match the 120' height limit, and are strategically placed to not hinder views from the Bayview hills.
Proposed 2016 Development

CP-02 (2016)
- Retail (2016)
- Hotel
- Multifamily
- Film Arts Center
- Parking

CP-03
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Status of Design in CP-02, CP-03 and CP-04

Block CPS-11A:
OCI Schematic Design Approved:
March 20, 2018

Block CPS-9A:
OCI Design Development Submitted:
Sept 1, 2016

Block CPS-8A:
OCI Design Development Submitted:
June 19, 2017

Block CPN-2A:
OCI Schematic Design Submitted:
March 20, 2018

Block CPC-Infield:
OCI Schematic Design Submitted:
March 5, 2016

Block CPN-10A:
OCI Schematic Design Approved:
December 5, 2017

Block CPN-11A:
OCI Schematic Design Approved:
May 7, 2018
Proposed Outfield + Infield Development

CP-02 (2019)
- Retail (2019)
- Hotel
- Multifamily
- Film Arts Center
- Office
- Parking
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Pedestrian Focus of Streets

- Montana Clark Drive is the most active "100% retail" street.
- Carmen Policy Avenue encourages pedestrian activity, although not as active as Montana Clark Drive.
- Arelious Walker Drive is a Primary Arterial street, with an enhanced sidewalk at the intersection of Jamestown Lane.
• High sunlight exposure is expected in the plaza areas adjacent to the Food Hall, especially during summer months (which have high average rates of clear skies).

• Retail corridor along Montana Clark Drive receives plenty of natural light due to its north-south orientation.
• Vehicular access avoids intersecting the Bus Rapid Transit Route running along Harney Way, including the proposed stop in front of the Film Arts Center.

• Access to the three Outfield parking structures is provided through two short lane-ways from either side of Arelious Walker.
3. VISION
Welcome to the new heart of Candlestick

The Outfield site is an eclectic mixed-use district comprised of office, retail and housing, woven together and framed around a dynamic public market and plaza.

Sense of Place

Candlestick is envisioned to be a walkable, 24/7, mixed-use community and a microcosm of the city that surrounds it: diverse, engaging, off-beat, lively, and endlessly enjoyable.
Retail Priority Street:
A series of active spaces to see and be 'scene'
Central Plaza:
The new 'heart' of Candlestick
A. APPENDIX
Chapter 4 Land Use, Design Standards & Guidelines
- Towers
- Residential

Section 5.3 Candlestick Center
- Open Space and Circulation
- Building Design
- Skyrise
- Parking

Section 6 Implementation

Section 7 Jamestown

Section 8.1 Appendix A - Term Definitions Modified or Added
• Two main wind directions: one coming from the West-Northwest (25% of the day probability) and another from the West (25% of the day probability).

• Wind conditions in the central plaza areas adjacent to the Food Hall are expected to be generally comfortable for sitting and standing.

• Source: Computational Fluid Dynamics (CFD) analysis of the proposed Outfield massing (including the Infield buildings and CP-North/South buildings one block away from the Outfield border).
Height of Bayview Hill: +425.0
View of Historic Stadium

Location 1 - 99 Ignacio Ave

Location 2 - 788 Jamestown Ave

Bayview Hill View Study
View of Proposed Massing

Location 1 - 99 Ignacio Ave

Location 2 - 788 Jamestown Ave
65 Ocean Fact Sheet

65 Ocean is a proposed mixed-use residential project in the Excelsior district. The project provides:

**New AFFORDABLE and ACCESSIBLE Family Housing**
- 193 new rental units, with a mix of unit sizes, including 41% 2/3 bedroom family-sized units.
- **Affordable housing for 1 in 4 tenants** - 48 affordable housing rental units will triple the number of new affordable units created in the district the last 10 years.
- **Neighborhood preference** for the 48 onsite affordable units will help locals secure housing
- Leasing forms and staff will be made available in Spanish, Tagalog, Cantonese, and Mandarin and multilingual workshops will be hosted to assist with applications for affordable units.

**Spanish Immersion Preschool**
- Over $2.5M will be invested to build-out of almost 9,000 sq. ft. of dedicated indoor and outdoor childcare space, including dedicated parking, and a loading zone drop-off area.
- Spanish-immersion preschool, The Crayon Box, will return **with capacity to serve 75 children.**
- The preschool will benefit from long-term discounted rent for many years to come.

**Workforce and Commitment to Union Labor**
- Over 500 union labor jobs paying the prevailing wage.
- Once completed, the project will create **up to 30 permanent full time jobs.**
- In partnership with Mission Hiring Hall, assistance will be provided to neighbors in preparing/applying for jobs during construction and for permanent jobs once complete.

**Community Art**
- A local artist will be commissioned to create a **mural that will pay homage to the community and spirit of the Excelsior/Outer Mission.**
- A partnership with Youth Art Exchange has been established to arrange for community youth and students at Leadership and Balboa High School to learn from the art installation process.

**Environmental Sustainability**
- Half of the property's roof area will include solar panels that will generate power, ultimately lowering operational costs for residents and the preschool.
- Approx. 10,000 sq. ft. of flow through planter space will alleviate the pressure on the stormwater system.
- The building foundation has been elevated to remove it from the floodplain/Cayuga Creek.

**Community**
- **Outreach has taken place for 3+ years,** including many discussions with residents/stakeholders.
- **Over 800+ letters of support and signatures,** the project has received overwhelming support from residents, neighborhood associations, community groups, nonprofits, merchants and other stakeholders, including:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Orgs./Childcare Orgs.:</th>
<th>Labor:</th>
<th>Merchants and Residents:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Crayon Box (MOU)</td>
<td>Plumbers &amp; Pipefitters (Local 38)</td>
<td>Parents of children at Little Bear and Crayon Box preschools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Little Bear School</td>
<td>IBEW (Local 6)</td>
<td>Individual Members of Friends of Persia Triangle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golden Bridges School</td>
<td>Sheet Metal Workers (Local 104)</td>
<td>Outer Mission merchants and residents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Art Exchange (MOU)</td>
<td>Sprinkler Fitters (Local 483)</td>
<td>Mission Street merchants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACES SF</td>
<td>Laborers’ Local 261</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission Hiring Hall (MOU)</td>
<td>Labor Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF Housing Action Coalition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art of AIDS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bay Area Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height Limit</td>
<td>HOME-SF+ (2019)</td>
<td>HOME-SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50' Alemany &amp; 40' Cayuga</td>
<td>50' Alemany &amp; 40' Cayuga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMR Rate</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit Count</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMR Count</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55% AMI</td>
<td>19 / 10%</td>
<td>19 / 10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80% AMI</td>
<td>15 / 8%</td>
<td>15 / 8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110% AMI</td>
<td>14 / 7%</td>
<td>14 / 7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studios</td>
<td>47 / 24%</td>
<td>52 / 27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-BR</td>
<td>59 / 31%</td>
<td>81 / 43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-BR + Den</td>
<td>8 / 4%</td>
<td>0 / 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-BR</td>
<td>57 / 30%</td>
<td>42 / 21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-BR</td>
<td>22 / 11%</td>
<td>18 / 9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DISTRICT 9 & 11
65 OCEAN VS. MOHCD 100% AFFORDABLE PROJECTS
2000-2019

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Planning Commission Approval Hearing
October 24, 2019

CANDLESTICK POINT
DESIGN FOR DEVELOPMENT

REVISIONS 2019
CANDLESTICK DESIGN-FOR-DEVELOPMENT

1. Background – Master Approvals
2. Background – Subsequent Approvals and Amendments
3. Current Proposal
4. Design-for-Development Revisions
Candlestick Point
Master Approvals

Approvals Under Planning Commission Jurisdiction:

- Bayview Hunters Point Redevelopment Plan Amendments
- Candlestick Point Sub-Area Plan
- Candlestick Point Special Use District
- Candlestick Point Design-for-Development

Legend
- Candlestick Mixed-Use Residential District
- Candlestick Center Mixed-Use Commercial District
- Open Space District
Candlestick Point
Master Approvals
Approvals Not Under Planning Department Jurisdiction:

- Disposition and Development Agreement (DDA) including:
  - Infrastructure Plan
  - Transportation Plan
  - Sustainability Strategy
  - Community Benefits Package
  - DRDAP
Candlestick Point
Subsequent Approvals

**Major Phase 1**
Approved: 2014
Amended: 2016

**Sub-Phase 01**
(Alice Griffith)
Approved: 2014
Completed: 2016

**Sub-Phases 02-03-04**
Initially Approved: 2016
Candlestick Point
Subsequent Amendments

2016 Amendments:
• Minor in Nature for Refinements to CP Center

2018 Amendments
• Focused on Hunters Point Shipyard
• Removed Jamestown Parcel
• Transferred 993 units from HPS to CP
• Allowed future transfer of 118,500 gsf of office from HPS to CP
## Candlestick Point – Current Proposal

### Land Use Comparison (CP Center in parenthesis)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential Units</td>
<td>6,225 (485)</td>
<td>7,218 (998)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>750,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Retail</td>
<td>635,000</td>
<td>170,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Retail</td>
<td>125,000 (1,000)</td>
<td>134,500 (5,800)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Facilities</td>
<td>50,000 (12,000)</td>
<td>50,000 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Venue / Arena</td>
<td>10,000 seats / 75,000 sf</td>
<td>4,400 seats / 5,000 sf Performance Venue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>220 rooms / 150,000 sf</td>
<td>220 rooms / 130,000 sf</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Candlestick Point – Current Proposal
Site Plan Comparison
D4D Revisions: Key Topics

Section 5.3: Candlestick Center

- Internal circulation, private streets
- Central Plaza and paseos
- Bulk & massing of buildings
- Build-to lines, ground floor activation, retail streets
- Parking facilities
- Vista terminations
- Skyway connection
D4D Revisions: Heights

- Removal of a 240' tower near Arelious Walker
- Increase from 65'/85'to 120' at Arelious Walker
- Increase from 65' to 85' within the interior
- Increase from 80' to 85' along frame
THANK YOU

Mat Snyder
Senior Planner
San Francisco Planning
Mathew.snyder@sfgov.org
www.sfplanning.org
Good morning Honorable Members of the Planning Commission. I have been a resident of San Francisco for over 70+ years. I'm sorry I can not be at your tomorrow's meeting for item #14 (on your agenda). But trust me I'm in full support for this most wonderful project and can't wait for it to happen. The Candlestick Point project. This project/plan has been around for too long. I have had a wonderful chance to follow this since early 2016 (CCII). I believe this Amended Document does a good job and needs your approval @ this phase.

Having said that, I too would like your approval. These delays all to often cause the sponsor/s additional funds with construction cost, etc. and or just plain move on. After your approval I would like to see this project be put on a fast track thru the planning process. Further delays may impact this project. We need this housing. It is a wonderful site for such a great master plan. I do not want to loose this PROJECT. But mostly it's for our future generation. Sorry for the rambling email and hope this makes some sense.

If anyone has any comments and or concerns to my rambling email, please reach back to me with your questions and or concerns. Please share this email as needed and part of the projects documents.

------------------DHsf-------------------

Dennis Hong
La Shon A. Walker  
Director of Community Affairs  
FivePoint  
One Sansome Street, Suite 3200  
San Francisco, CA 94104  

RE: Candlestick Development  

Dear Ms. Walker:  

On behalf of the Southeast Community Facility Commission, we would like to thank you for your informative presentation and update on Fivepoint’s plans to amend its development concept for Candlestick Point and the surrounding area.  

The Commission was impressed with FivePoint’s ongoing commitment to the creation of jobs and affordable (including below market rate) housing. Moreover, FivePoint’s willingness to be flexible by right-sizing the mix of retail and office space as a response to the changing retail market is clever. We especially appreciate FivePoint’s inclusion of the community voices through thoughtful dialogue. It is critical that as our community continues to change, developers like FivePoint respect community as a valuable partner.  

While the SEFC does not have jurisdiction over the Candlestick development, as community stakeholders, stewards, leaders, and residents, we do have a vested interest in the project’s success. We appreciate the FivePoint team being willing to share the project details with us, answer our questions, and hear our feedback on ways to make the project its best.  

Therefore, we the members of the Southeast Facilities Commission have voted to provide this letter of support for the Candlestick Point Development, as we believe it will be a very important addition to our community.  

Sincerely,  

Gina Fromer  
Chair  

Amerika Sanchez  
Vice-Chair  

October 23, 2019
PROJECT UPDATE 1369 Sanchez Street
DBI Plan Review & Inspection
Planning Commission October 24, 2019
1. Existing and as-built
2. Permits
3. Plan Review
4. Inspections
5. Enforcement
6. Findings
7. Next Steps
This picture represent the property as it was in November 2017 prior to start of work.
1369 Sanchez Street (CURRENT)
1 P.A.#: 201508194709 (CPC, DBI, DPW)
Remodel front elevation/horizontal addition at south. Provide 3 new bedrooms & 2 new bathrooms at 3rd floor, remodel kitchen, add vanity at 2nd floor, relocate unit #1 from 2nd to 1st floor and new roof deck

2. P.A.#: 201808228032 (DBI, DPW) - FILED
To comply with NOV #201882681. revision to app#201508194709. revised demolition analysis including removal and replacement of front stairs. remove rear stairs
1. A single permit was filed on August 19, 2015, reviewed, approved and eventually issued on September 29, 2017. The valuation of work is documented on the permit as $425,000. Multiple city agencies reviewed and approved this building permit CPC, DBI, SFFD, SFPUC, DPW.

2. The permit included a states remodel at the front elevation and a horizontal addition at the south east corner of the property. Additionally, the descriptive language includes 3 new bedrooms, 2 new bathrooms at 3rd floor, remodel kitchen, add vanity at 2nd floor, relocate unit #1 from the 2nd to the 1st floor and a new roof deck.

3. This permit has been suspended and work stopped based on the issuance of a Notice of Violation (NOV) 201882681 by DBI on August 18, 2018.

4. A new building permit was filed on August 22, 2018. That permit # 201808228032 is currently being reviewed by the Planning Department. DBI plan review will follow Planning’s approval.
• Three building inspections were performed by the District Building Inspector for foundation pours from May 30 to June 27, 2018.

• These inspections were approved for different areas of the foundation based on Special Inspector approval prior to the concrete being poured.
• One complaint filed on August 6, 2018. One Notice of Violation (NOV) #201882681 was posted based on that complaint and is currently on hold pending the review and approval of the building permit currently under review.

• The complaint was investigated based on review of the site conditions as they related to the approved permit documents.

• It was determined that the scope of work documented on the drawings had been exceeded and the work was stopped pending the approval of a building permit to document the additional work.
**Notice of Violation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WORK WITHOUT PERMIT</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADDITIONAL WORK PERMIT REQUIRED</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXPRESSED OR CANCELLED PERMIT</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNSAFE BUILDING</td>
<td>(4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**VIOLATION DESCRIPTION:**

A complaint investigation has revealed work has exceeded scope of PA201508194709. A site visit has revealed:
1) front stairs and west front wall have been removed. 2) rear wall and rear stairs have been removed. 3) portion of floor framing systems at 3rd floor area have been removed.

Code/Section: SFBC 106A.4.7

Monthly Monitoring Fee. Code/Section: SFBC 110A, Table 1A-K.

**CORRECTIVE ACTION:**

- **STOP ALL WORK SFBC 104.2.4**
  - 415-375-6811

- **FILE BUILDING PERMIT WITHIN 30 DAYS**
  - (WITH PLANS) A copy of this Notice must accompany the Permit Application.

- **CERTAIN PERMIT WITHIN 60 DAYS AND COMPLETE ALL WORK WITHIN 90 DAYS, INCLUDING FINAL INSPECTION AND FINISH.**

- **CORRECT VIOLATIONS WITHIN 30 DAYS.**
  - NO PERMIT REQUIRED

- **YOU FAILED TO COMPLY WITH THE NOTICE(S) DATED, THEREFORE THIS DEPT. HAS INITIATED ABATEMENT PROCEEDINGS.**

- **FAILURE TO COMPLY WITH THIS NOTICE WILL CAUSE ABATEMENT PROCEEDINGS TO BEGIN. SEE ATTACHMENT FOR ADDITIONAL WARNINGS.**

Stop all work associated with the above referenced permit. Obtain a revision permit that documents all front facade, rear walls, stairs and floor systems removed. An exceed scope of PA201508194709. City Planning approval is required.

INVESTIGATION FEE OR OTHER FEE WILL APPLY

- $120 FEE (WORK W/O PERMIT AFTER 9/1/60)
- $120 FEE (WORK EXCEEDING SCOPE OF PERMIT)
- NO FEE

- NO PENALTY
Approved Demolition
# TABULATION FOR LINEAR FOOTAGE MEASUREMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WALL</th>
<th>REMOVED</th>
<th>LENGTH TO REMAIN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22.5'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>97.0</td>
<td>62.5'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## LINEAR FOOTAGE MEASUREMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ELEMENT</th>
<th>LENGTH</th>
<th>REMOVED</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A FRONT FACADE</td>
<td>26'-6&quot;</td>
<td>3'-6&quot;</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C REAR FACADE</td>
<td>25'-0&quot;</td>
<td>25'-0&quot;</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL (B,C)</td>
<td>52'-6&quot;</td>
<td>29'-6&quot;</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B SIDE FACADE 1</td>
<td>45'-6&quot;</td>
<td>26'-6&quot;</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D SIDE FACADE 2</td>
<td>45'-6&quot;</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRAND TOTAL (A,B,C,D)</td>
<td>143'-0&quot;</td>
<td>56'-0&quot;</td>
<td>39% &lt; 65%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## AREA MEASUREMENTS

### VERTICAL ELEMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ELEVATION</th>
<th>SQ FT</th>
<th>DEMOLISH</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FRONT</td>
<td>836 SQ FT</td>
<td>481 SQ FT</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REAR</td>
<td>846 SQ FT</td>
<td>115 SQ FT</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIDE 1 NORTH</td>
<td>1,606 SQ FT</td>
<td>244 SQ FT</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIDE 2 SOUTH</td>
<td>1,606 SQ FT</td>
<td>981 SQ FT</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VERTICAL TOTAL</td>
<td>4,888 SQ FT</td>
<td>1,822 SQ FT</td>
<td>37% &lt; 50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### HORIZONTAL ELEMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FLOOR</th>
<th>EXISTING</th>
<th>DEMOLISH</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2ND FLOOR</td>
<td>1,122 SQ FT</td>
<td>0 SQ FT</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3RD FLOOR</td>
<td>1,122 SQ FT</td>
<td>0 SQ FT</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROOF</td>
<td>1,122 SQ FT</td>
<td>1,046 SQ FT</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HORIZONTAL TOTAL</td>
<td>3,336 SQ FT</td>
<td>1,046 SQ FT</td>
<td>31% &lt; 50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Based on the site investigation additional demolition was noted.

The additional demolition of floor joists was primarily due to the horizontal addition at the south elevation which meant that longer joist would be need to span to the expanded building footprint.

The additional demo at the rear included the removal and rebuilding of portions of the east elevation.

Unapproved demo occurred at the rear at the sidewalls for about 6 feet.

There was some minimal additional demo at the façade.
Next Steps

• PA# 201808228032 is currently being reviewed by The Planning Department and appears to document the as built conditions and the changes needed to ensure compliance with the DBI NOV # 201882681.

• This filed corrective permit seems to be comprehensive based on site visit and review of drawings. The existing, as-built and proposed conditions are now shown on the drawings.

• When a building permit is approved and issued a start of work inspection will be scheduled for review and direction will be given to the stakeholder.
QUESTION & ANSWER
Thank you!