



SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

General Plan Referral

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

Reception:
415.558.6378

Fax:
415.558.6409

Planning
Information:
415.558.6377

Date: April 11, 2019
Case No.: Case No. 2019-003985GPR
Acquisition of 814-820 Bryant St + 470 6th St

Block/Lot No.: 3959/009, 3959/012, 3959/014
Project Sponsor: City and County of San Francisco Real Estate Division

Applicant: Jeff Suess
City and County of San Francisco Real Estate Division
25 Van Ness Ave, Suite #400
San Francisco, CA 94102

Staff Contact: Ben Caldwell – (415) 575-9131
Ben.caldwell@sfgov.org

Recommendation: Finding the project, on balance, is **in conformity** with the General Plan

Recommended By: 
for John Rahaim, Director of Planning

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The project is a property acquisition of three contiguous parcels in the South of Market (SoMa) neighborhood, by the City of San Francisco, from private owners, with the existing use to be continued upon purchase. The three parcels are adjacent to the Hall of Justice, and are currently used as parking for City-owned vehicles, since the McDonald’s fast-food restaurant on the property closed prior to this use. This parking lot use is proposed to continue upon property acquisition. A Notice of Special Restriction (NSR) was recorded on this property on 4/27/2017 allowing a conditional use authorization for temporary operation of a commercial parking lot, for a period of 3 years from date of record, or until 4/27/2020, after this General Plan Referral recommendation. This NSR and its conditions run with the property and not with particular project sponsor, and as such will remain in effect upon acquisition. The submittal is for a General Plan Referral to recommend whether the Project is in conformity with the General Plan, pursuant to Section 4.105 of the Charter, and Section 2A.52 and 2A.53 of the Administrative Code.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

This change in ownership is not defined as a project under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Sections 15378 and 15060(c)(2) because it does not result in a direct or indirect physical change in the environment..

GENERAL PLAN COMPLIANCE AND BASIS FOR RECOMMENDATION

The project is a property acquisition by the City and County of San Francisco and there is no change in use planned upon acquisition. The Project is consistent with the Eight Priority Policies of Planning Code Section 101.1 as described in the body of this letter and is, on balance, **in-conformity** with the following Objectives and Policies of the General Plan:

COMMERCE AND INDUSTRY ELEMENT

POLICY 4.6

Assist in the provision of available land for site expansion.

Although San Francisco has considerable amount of underused land available for industrial development, land is not always available in locations where new development is desired or feasible. A major problem facing many San Francisco industries is the lack of room for expansion. The cost of acquiring adjacent property, if it is developed, may be prohibitive to the firm. The initiation of small scale redevelopment activities to eliminate obsolescent and vacant buildings would allow land to become available for new development. Such actions might well prove financially beneficial to the city if vacant parcels and buildings could be utilized to generate increased tax revenues. Formation of a land bank by selected parcels of land received by the City could aid industries beneficial to the city by providing a relocation resource.

The land acquisition will allow the City of San Francisco to preserve land in a developing mixed-use area for future development.

POLICY 6.9

Regulate uses so that traffic impacts and parking problems are minimized.

New, expanding or relocating uses should not significantly increase traffic congestion or parking problems. Each use should be evaluated for its anticipated impacts on the transportation systems (i.e. traffic circulation, parking, transit service, pedestrian circulation) particularly during peak traffic hours and with respect to surrounding residential areas. The degree of detail in the analysis should be commensurate with the size and location of the use (compared with traffic volumes and parking availability), its potential as a heavy trip generator and the level of transportation and parking in the vicinity.

The land acquisition will minimize traffic impacts and parking problems by not changing the existing use upon purchase. Its current use represents a reduction in traffic from its previous use as a fast-food restaurant.

HOUSING ELEMENT**OBJECTIVE 1****Assist in the provision of available land for site expansion.**

MOH shall continue to actively pursue surplus or underused publicly-owned land for housing potential, working with agencies not subject to the Surplus Property Ordinance such as the SFPUC, SFUSD and MTA to identify site opportunities early and quickly. City agencies shall continue to survey their properties for affordable housing opportunities or joint use potential, and OEWD and MOH will establish a Public Sites Program that will assist in identifying opportunity sites and priorities for affordable housing development.

Though no use change is planned after acquisition, in the long-term this land acquisition could allow the City of San Francisco to decide, at a future date, to develop this land to increase the supply of affordable housing.

PROPOSITION M FINDINGS – PLANNING CODE SECTION 101.1

Planning Code Section 101.1 establishes Eight Priority Policies and requires review of discretionary approvals and permits for consistency with said policies. The Project is found to be consistent with the Eight Priority Policies as set forth in Planning Code Section 101.1 for the following reasons:

Eight Priority Policies Findings

The subject project is found to be consistent with the Eight Priority Policies of Planning Code Section 101.1 in that:

The proposed project is found to be consistent with the eight priority policies of Planning Code Section 101.1 in that:

1. That existing neighborhood-serving retail uses be preserved and enhanced and future opportunities for resident employment in and ownership of such businesses enhanced.

The Project would have no adverse effect on neighborhood serving retail uses or opportunities for employment in or ownership of such businesses.

2. That existing housing and neighborhood character be conserved and protected in order to preserve the cultural and economic diversity of our neighborhood.

The Project would have no adverse effect on the City's housing stock or on neighborhood character.

3. That the City's supply of affordable housing be preserved and enhanced.

The Project would have no adverse effect on the City's supply of affordable housing, and, by bringing the site under public ownership, could enable the development of public affordable housing at some future date.

4. That commuter traffic not impede MUNI transit service or overburden our streets or neighborhood parking.

The Project would not result affect commuter traffic or MUNI transit service. Allowing the continued use of the parking lot for City-owned vehicles could help minimize the need for City vehicles from adjoining City-owned facilities to require neighborhood on-street parking spaces.

5. That a diverse economic base be maintained by protecting our industrial and service sectors from displacement due to commercial office development, and that future opportunities for residential employment and ownership in these sectors be enhanced.

The Project would not affect the existing economic base in this area.

6. That the City achieve the greatest possible preparedness to protect against injury and loss of life in an earthquake.

The Project would not adversely affect achieving the greatest possible preparedness against injury and loss of life in an earthquake. Continuing the use as a City-owned parking lot could enable the site's use for mobilization and recovery efforts in the event of an emergency such as an earthquake.

7. That landmarks and historic buildings be preserved.

The Project would have no adverse effect on landmarks or historic resources.

8. That our parks and open space and their access to sunlight and vistas be protected from development.

The Project would have no adverse effect on parks and open space or their access to sunlight and vista.

RECOMMENDATION:	Finding the Project, on balance, in-conformity with the General Plan
------------------------	---