

July 8, 2019

Nicholas Foster  
San Francisco Planning Department  
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400  
San Francisco, CA 94103

RE: **3333 Cal SF – Plan Check Letter #2 Response**

CASE NUMBER #: 2015-014028CUA

Dear Mr. Foster,

The project team has reviewed the Planning Departments comments, issued in PCL#2 Dated May 21, 2019. Please find our written responses to the comments below, as well as sheet numbers for the location of the revisions in the attached Planning Application Resubmittal #2.

**1ai. Open Space (Section 135), Private, Euclid Building:**

**Response:** Sheet A8.41 was revised to remove the private open space for the southern-most unit on the Euclid West façade. For reference, Section 1 on sheet A8.25 has been expanded and additional sections have been added to new sheets A8.26 and A8.27. These sections demonstrate private open space in compliance with Section 135 (f)(2)(C) for the remaining (5 of 6) West-facing units on Euclid Building Level 1—i.e. ‘no point on any... wall or projection is higher than one foot for each foot that such point is horizontally distant from the opposite side of the clear space in the court’ for three sides. Note that overhead building overhangs are permitted obstructions per 136(C)(5). 100 SF of private open space were removed from the Euclid Building. Sheet G3.03 has been revised to include the additional Common Open Space required by this change.

**1bi. Open Space (Section 135), Common, Euclid Building:**

**Response:** Sheet A8.06 and A8.44 have been revised to reflect a minimum horizontal dimension of 15’ for Euclid building Common Open Space at Roof Deck per section 135(g)(1).

**1bii. Open Space (Section 135), Common, Center Building B:**

**Response:** Sheet A6.42 has been revised and includes the dimension of the Common Open Space and an excerpt of the code to demonstrate compliance. Sheet G3.03 has been revised to include the additional Common Open Space required by this change.

**2a. Exposure (Section 140) Plaza and Euclid buildings with Center A:**

**Response:** Sheet A6.46 has not been modified since these comments refer to how the center buildings affect others, not the other way around. The original drawings have addressed the units on Center A and B. No Plaza A or B units have primary exposure facing Center A and therefore are not impacted by the Center A massing. For Euclid Building dwelling unit exposure compliance, see response 2f below.

**BAR**architects

Architecture

Planning

Interiors

901 Battery Street  
Suite 300  
San Francisco, CA 94111

415 293 5700

www.bararch.com

**2b. Exposure (Section 140) Walnut and Masonic buildings with Center B building:**

**Response:** Sheet A6.46 has not been modified since these comments refer to how the center buildings affect others, not the other way around. The original drawings have addressed the units on Center A and B. Section 140 does not apply to the Walnut Building in the Base Project as it does not contain residential uses. A cut plane has been added to the project variant to demonstrate compliance – see VAR.34. For Masonic Building dwelling unit exposure compliance, see response 2e below.

**2c. Exposure (Section 140) Mayfair building with Center A building:**

**Response:** Sheet A6.47 has not been modified since these comments refer to how the center buildings affect others, not the other way around. The original drawings have addressed the units on Center A and B. For Mayfair Building dwelling unit exposure compliance, see response 2h below.

**2d. Exposure (Section 140) Walnut building with Center B building:**

**Response:** Sheet A6.47 has not been modified since these comments refer to how the center buildings affect others, not the other way around. The original drawings have addressed the units on Center A and B, see response 2b above.

**2e. Exposure (Section 140) Masonic Building with Center B:**

**Response:** Drawing 2 on Sheet A7.24 as previously submitted represents the condition for all Masonic Building units facing Center B along the interior court. The exposure plane profile provided demonstrates compliance with Section 140.

**2f. Exposure (Section 140) Euclid Building with Center A:**

**Response:** Drawing 2 on Sheet A8.21 represents the condition for all Euclid units facing Center A along the interior court. The exposure plane profile provided demonstrates North-facing L1 and L2 units are not in compliance with Section 140. A modification to Section 140 is requested as indicated on Sheet A8.01 and A8.02. Four (4) units were added to the original modification request of three (3) at this location. Sheet G3.05 has been updated to reflect this revision.

**2g. Exposure (Section 140) Euclid Building at Interior Court:**

**Response:** Section 1 on Sheet A8.25 has been expanded and additional sections have been added to on new Sheet A8.26 and A8.27. These sections demonstrate compliance for (2 of 6) West-facing units on Euclid Building Level 1. An exception is requested for the (4) remaining units as indicated on Sheet A8.01. Sheet G3.05 has been updated to reflect this revision.

**2h. Exposure (Section 140) Mayfair Building with Center A:**

**Response:** Drawings 1 & 2 on Sheet A9.21 represents the section through the interior court between Mayfair and Center A building. Note that no Mayfair building units face exclusively into this interior court.

**2i. Exposure (Section 140) Mayfair Building with Laurel Duplexes:**

**Response:** *Drawing 1 on Sheet A9.22 represents the condition for all Mayfair units facing the North-most Laurel Duplex. The exposure plane profile provided demonstrates (2) L1 units are not in compliance with Section 140. A modification to Section 140 has been requested for these (2) units as indicated on sheet A9.01. Note that (2) units were mistakenly identified as requiring a modification on L2. This notation has been removed from drawing 1 on Sheet A9.02.*

**2j. Exposure (Section 140) EIR Variant: Walnut Building, Level 1 units fronting west interior courtyard (VAR.17):**

**Response:** *Project documents previously identified the lower level units in the Project Variant facing the west courtyard that required an Exposure Variance. These are not identified on Sheet G3.05 as that sheet pertains to the Base Project only. Additional dimensions have been provided on Sheet VAR.17-20 to show compliance of units not requiring a modification.*

**3a. Plaza A: entrance is 12' (A2.00); curb cut is 18' (C2.02).**

**Response:** *Per SDAT comments the garage door has been increased in size to a single 20-ft garage door that can accommodate two-way traffic (Sheet A2.00). The curb cut dimension has been revised to 20-ft, see Sheet C2.02.*

**3b. Walnut (from Presidio Avenue): entrance is 20' (loading) and 15' (parking) (A1.01); (E) curb cut is 29'; this garage door exceeds the 20' and will require an exception through the PUD/CUA.**

**Response:** *The Presidio entrance is as described above, which is code complying per Sec. 144(b)(1) which permits 20-ft wide entrances, and "where two or more entrances are provided there shall be a minimum separation between such entrances of six feet." Each door is 20' or less and the two entry doors are separated by a 7' dimension, meeting the requirement of the code. The curb cut dimension shown on Sheet A1.01 has been revised to 29' to match the existing condition per Sheet C2.02.*

**3c. Masonic: entrance is 20-ft (A7.01) curb cut is 24' (C2.02)**

**Response:** *Per SDAT comments the curb-cut has been reduced to 20-ft, Sheet C2.02.*

**3d. Center Building egress: please show dimension of garage door if applicable (A1.01); curb cut is 29' (C2.02)**

**Response:** *The egress lane from the California Parking Garage to Masonic is 16-ft with a corresponding curb cut of 16'-ft. A 12-ft wide garage door has been added. See Sheets A1.01, A4.00, VAR.11 and VAR.14.*

**3e. Mayfair: entrance is 20' (A9.01); curb cut from Laurel is 21' (C2.02)**

**Response:** *Per SDAT comments the curb-cut has been reduced to 18-ft, Sheet C2.02.*

**3f. Parking/Loading Entrances (Section 144) Laurel Duplexes:**

**Response:** *Dimensions (10-ft) for Laurel Street duplex garages were added to Sheet A10.01.*

**4a. Childcare Parking (Section 151.1): 29 spaces are proposed where 11 spaces is the maximum permitted (1.5 spaces /25 children above 24 children; Project proposes a child care facility with 179 children)**

**Response:** *Project Sponsor is requesting modification in the SUD to allow for a parking rate of 1.5 parking spaces for each nine (9) children to be accommodated at any one, see Sheet A1.01.*

**4b. Retail/Commercial Parking: The DEIR (p. 4.C.80) identifies a required Mitigation Measure (“M-TR-2: Reduce Retail Parking Supply”) to lessen the impact of the proposed Project’s or Project Variant’s parking supply for retail uses to less-than-significant levels. The Mitigation Measure limits parking for Retail Sales and Service Uses to 2.14 spaces per 1,000 gross square feet and is inclusive of the proposed 60 commercial/public parking spaces that would be made available for the general public. Please demonstrate compliance with this Mitigation Measure on future plans submittals.**

**a. Project: 146 parking spaces are provided where 86 are permitted per the Mitigation Measure. Therefore, 60 commercial/public parking spaces must be eliminated.**

**Response:** *Removed the sixty (60) accessory parking spaces to comply with Mitigation Measure “M-TR-2: Reduce Retail Parking Supply” and the plans have been updated, see Sheets A1.01 – A1.03.*

**b. Project Variant: 136 parking spaces are provided where 74 are permitted per the Mitigation Measure. Therefore, a total of 62 spaces must be eliminated (60 commercial/public parking spaces + 2 spaces for retail).**

**Response:** *Removed the sixty (60) accessory parking spaces and the two extra retail parking spaces to comply with Mitigation Measure “M-TR-2: Reduce Retail Parking Supply” and the plans have been updated, see Sheets VAR.11 – VAR.13.*

**Base Project**

*Plaza A: 14,816 SF (Retail)*

*Plaza B: 11,180 SF (Retail)*

*Walnut: 14,265 SF (Retail)*

*Total Retail: 40,261 SF*

*40,261/1000 SF = 40 x 2.14 spaces = 86 (No Revision Required)*

**Project Variant**

*Plaza A: 14,816 SF (Retail)*

*Plaza B: 11,180 SF (Retail)*

*Walnut: 8,500 SF (Retail)*

*Total Retail: 34,496 SF*

*34,496/1000 SF = 35 x 2.14 spaces = 74 (Revise Sheet VAR.01b)*

**4d. NEW: Commercial Loading Zone (California Street)**

**Response:** *The 100' commercial loading zoning on California Street that was located closest to Laurel Street (Sheet C2.02) has been reconfigured. The revised commercial loading zone on California Street has been divided into separate 60' and 40' zones. The 60' commercial loading zone on California is west of Walnut and the other 40' commercial zone is east of Walnut on California Street (see Sheet C2.02). Any color curb designation reflected on the plans is subject the review and final determination of the SFMTA color curb program, see Sheet C2.02.*

**5a. Bicycle Parking (Section 155.1) Class 1: Office Use: 3 additional Class 1 spaces are required based on 39,999 OFA.**

**Response:** *A total of eight (8) bicycle parking spaces are required and reflected on the revised Sheets G0.01, G3.01b, A4.01.*

**5b. Bicycle Parking (Section 155.1) Class 2: Retail (general) 1 additional stall required.**

**Response:** *The data matrix on Sheet G3.01b has been updated to reflect the eight (8) Class 2 bicycle spaces required. Eight (8) spaces were already being provided, so no changes have been made to the drawings.*

**6a. Shower Facilities and Lockers (Section 155.4): Please show location for retail requirement, only office is shown.**

**Response:** *Retail Showers (1) and Lockers (6) are provided in the Plaza B building (see Sheet A3.00). Office Showers (2) and Lockers (12) were not previously provided, but have now been included and are located on Level B2 of the Walnut Building, see Sheets A1.02 and A4.01. Childcare is provided with lockers (6) and shower (1) on level B2, see Sheets A1.02, A4.01, VAR.12 and VAR.15.*

**7. TDM (Section 169): 50% compliance is required based on a 3/29/16 EEA submittal date.**

a.) Retail: Required 16/Provided 16; Checklist to be updated  
 b.) Office + Childcare: Required 10/Provided 11; Code-compliant  
 c.) Residential: Required 16/Provided 16; Code-compliant

**Response:** *The project sponsor is working with the City, through the Development Agreement, to increase TDM compliance beyond the 50% compliance requirement. The project will meet, and likely exceed, 50% compliance.*

**8. Height (Section 260): Response**

- a.) Plaza A (45') Sheets A2.21-22
- b.) Plaza B (45') Sheets A3.21-24
- c.) Walnut (45') Sheets A4.21a-b, A4.22-25
- d.) Existing Center A (52'-10"); Proposed Center A (80') Sheet A6.14
- e.) Existing Center B (79'-4"); Proposed Center B (92') Sheet A6.13
- f.) Masonic (40') Sheets A7.21-25
- g.) Euclid (40') Sheets A8.21-25
- h.) Laurel Duplexes (40') Sheets A10.21-25
- i.) Mayfair (40') Sheets A9.21-22
- j.) EIR Variant: Walnut Building (67') Sheets VAR.31-34

9. **NEW: Other plan updates based on other applications for consistency purposes**

- a.) Pedestrian crosswalk on Mayfair was removed because it terminated into an existing residential driveway, see Sheet L2.01.
- b.) Bulb-out on the corner of Presidio/Pine was slightly modified after the California egress only curb-cut was reduced from 29-ft to 16-ft, see Sheet L2.03.
- c.) Masonic garage was slightly redesigned to reduce the amount of excavation, see Sheet C3.00.
- d.) Euclid Building added a pool that would be available to on-site residents, see Sheet A8.01.

Sincerely,



Zach Prowda  
BAR Architects

cc: PSKS, SCB, Jensen Architects, MSLA, ARUP, BKF, SWCA, CPDB  
encl: Planning Application Resubmittal 2