



GENERAL PLAN REFERRAL

February 1, 2022

Case No.: 2022-000701GPR
Block/Lot No.: 297 Alta Vista Drive, South San Francisco, CA 94080
Block C, Lot 14
Project Sponsor: San Francisco International Airport
Applicant: Audrey Park – (415) 554-9872
Audrey.park@flysfo.com
San Francisco International Airport – Planning and Environmental Affairs
P.O. Box 8097
San Francisco, CA 94128
Staff Contact: Reanna Tong – (628) 652-7458
reanna.tong@sfgov.org

Recommended By: 
AnMarie Rodgers, Director of Citywide Policy for Rich Hillis, Director of Planning

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

Project Description

The property owner proposes construction of an additional residential structure at 297 Alta Vista Drive, South San Francisco, San Mateo County, California. The proposed structure would comprise the construction of 9,428 square feet within an existing lot. Because the project is located within the 65-decibel Community Noise Equivalent Level contour for the San Francisco International Airport (SFO), the San Mateo County Airport Land Use Commission conditionally approve the proposed development, pending the property owner grant of an avigation easement to the City and County of San Francisco, as the proprietor of SFO. This is a requirement under Policy NP-3 (Grant of Avigation Easement) of the Comprehensive Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan for the Environs of San Francisco International Airport (ALUCP) for SFO. The ALUCP was prepared according to the California Public Utilities Code and the Caltrans Division of the Aeronautics Airport Land Use Planning Handbook.

The ALUCP addresses issues related to compatibility between airport operations and proposed new land use developments, considering noise impacts, safety of persons on the ground and in flight, height restrictions/airspace protection, and overflight notification. Land use development within the Airport Influence Area is governed by the ALUCP, which was adopted by the City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County (C/CAG) in October 2012. The ALUCP designates all of San Mateo County as the Airport Influence Area.

The ALUCP requires new development within the 65 dB CNEL or greater contour to be made compatible with aircraft noise by the developer in accordance with California Code of Regulations, Title 21, Section 5014. This includes insulating all habitable rooms to an interior CNEL of 45 dB or lower. See ALUCP Policy NP-4.1. Prior to sale, developers must also provide notice to owners of the proximity to SFO and of the potential impacts that could occur on the property from airport/aircraft operations.

The owner of 297 Alta Vista Drive has agreed to grant an avigation easement to CCSF, as required by the ALUCP. The avigation easement, the owner waives its right to legal action against CCSF for these impacts. The covenants and agreements in the avigation easement would run with the land in perpetuity and bind any grantee, heir, agent, successor, or assign of a developer who acquires any estate or interest in or right to use property, for the benefit of CCSF and its agents, successors, and assigns.

A map of the project site with the SFO 2019 CNEL 65 dB noise contour labeled is attached.

The project under consideration for this General Plan Referral is the granting of a perpetual avigation easement to CCSF, allowing for the passage of aircraft and the right to cause noise and other incidental effects of aircraft operations to and from SFO.

Environmental Review

Real estate transaction only. Not defined as a project under CEQA Guidelines Sections 15378 and 15060(c)(2) because it would not result in a direct or indirect physical change in the environment.

General Plan Compliance and Basis for Recommendation

As described below, the proposed easements to CCSF is consistent with the Eight Priority Policies of Planning Code Section 101.1 and is, on balance, in conformity with the Objectives and Policies of the General Plan.

Note: General Plan Objectives are shown in **BOLD UPPER CASE** font; Policies are in **Bold** font; staff comments are in *italic* font.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION ELEMENT

OBJECTIVE 11

PROMOTE LAND USES THAT ARE COMPATIBLE WITH VARIOUS TRANSPORTATION NOISE LEVELS.

Policy 11.1

Discourage new uses in areas in which the noise level exceeds the noise compatibility guidelines for that use.

Policy 11.2

Consider the relocation to more appropriate areas of those land uses which need more quiet and cannot be effectively insulated from noise in their present location, as well as those land uses which are noisy and are presently in noise-sensitive areas.

The proposed aviation easement addresses issues related to compatibility between airport operations and proposed new land use developments by allowing for the passage of aircraft and right to cause noise and other incidental effects of aircraft operations to and from SFO. Also as noted above, in accordance with the ALUCP, the subject development will be required to insulate all habitable rooms to an interior CNEL of 45 dB or lower per California Code of Regulations, Title 21, Section 5014.

TRANSPORTATION ELEMENT

OBJECTIVE 5

SUPPORT AND ENAHNCE THE ROLE OF SAN FRANCISCO AS A MAJOR DESTINATION AND DEPARTURE POINT FOR TRAVELERS MAKING INTERSTATE, NATIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL TRIPS

Policy 5.1

Support and accommodate the expansion of San Francisco International Airport, while balancing this expansion with the protection of the quality of life in the communities that surround the Airport.

The proposed easement would allow SFO to conduct passage of aircraft and the right to cause noise and other incidental effects of aircraft operations to and from SFO. This allows SFO to continue to serve its function as a travel hub between the City and other areas.

Planning Code Section 101 Findings

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:

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 not have a negative effect on existing neighborhood-serving retail uses and will not have a negative effect on opportunities for resident employment in and ownership of neighborhood-serving retail, in either San Francisco County or San Mateo County.

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

The Project would not have a negative effect on housing or neighborhood character in San Francisco County.

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

The Project would not have an adverse effect on the City's supply of affordable housing.

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

The Project would not result in commuter traffic impeding MUNI transit service or overburdening the streets or neighborhood parking in San Francisco County.

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 resident employment and ownership in these sectors be enhanced;

The Project would not cause displacement of the industrial or service sectors due to office development, and future opportunities for resident employment or ownership in these sectors would not be impaired for San Francisco County.

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

The Project would not have an adverse effect on City's preparedness against injury and loss of life in an earthquake.

7. That the landmarks and historic buildings be preserved;

The Project would not have an adverse effect on the City's Landmarks and historic buildings.

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

The Project would not have an adverse effect on the City's parks and open space and their access to sunlight and vistas.

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

Attachments:

None