



49 South Van Ness Avenue, Suite 1400 San Francisco, CA 94103 628.652.7600 www.sfplanning.org

GENERAL PLAN REFERRAL

December 14, 2022

2022-011372GPR

Property Address:

Case No.:

767 Pine Street/711 7th Avenue, San Bruno, CA 552 4th Avenue, San Bruno, CA 657 East Angus Avenue, San Bruno, CA 553 Euclid Avenue, San Bruno, CA 539 5th Avenue, San Bruno, CA 819 Easton Avenue, San Bruno, CA 917 Hensley Avenue, San Bruno, CA 5 Verano Drive, South San Francisco, CA 16 Fairway Drive, South San Francisco, CA 21 Jacinto Lane, South San Francisco, CA 34 Wilms Avenue, South San Francisco, CA 65 Capay Circle, South San Francisco, CA 78 Escanyo Drive, South San Francisco, CA 137 Ramona Avenue, South San Francisco, CA 150 Northwood Drive, South San Francisco, CA 155 Northwood Drive, South San Francisco, CA 202 Northwood Drive, South San Francisco, CA 223 Brentwood Drive, South San Francisco, CA 230 Brentwood Drive, South San Francisco, CA 260 Rainier Avenue, South San Francisco, CA 327 Altamont Drive, South San Francisco, CA 330 Newman Drive, South San Francisco, CA 334 Newman Drive, South San Francisco, CA 349 Granada Drive, South San Francisco, CA 366 Altamont Drive, South San Francisco, CA 366 Valencia Drive, South San Francisco, CA 411 Hazelwood Drive, South San Francisco, CA 412 Alhambra Road, South San Francisco, CA 437 Valencia Drive, South San Francisco, CA 516 Valverde Drive, South San Francisco, CA 752 Haven Avenue, South San Francisco, CA 8 Verano Drive, South San Francisco, CA 11 Dana Court, South San Francisco, CA 20 Carlsbad Court, South San Francisco, CA

171 Northwood Drive, South San Francisco, CA 220 Wildwood Drive, South San Francisco, CA 225 Southcliff Avenue, South San Francisco, CA 228 Hazelwood Drive, South San Francisco, CA 232 Pinehurst Way, South San Francisco, CA 304 Granada Drive, South San Francisco, CA 344 Avalon Drive, South San Francisco, CA 357 Ponderosa Road, South San Francisco, CA 377 Ponderosa Road, South San Francisco, CA 708 Hill Avenue, South San Francisco, CA 22 Wilms Avenue, South San Francisco, CA 58 Greenwood Drive, South San Francisco, CA 64 Capay Circle, South San Francisco, CA 107 Escanyo Drive, South San Francisco, CA 108 Knoll Circle, South San Francisco, CA 110 Verano Drive, South San Francisco, CA 206 Manor Drive, South San Francisco, CA 222 Manor Drive, South San Francisco, CA 231 Hazelwood Drive, South San Francisco, CA 234 Rockwood Drive, South San Francisco, CA 311 Hazelwood Drive, South San Francisco 319 Rockwood Drive, South San Francisco, CA 323 Rockwood Drive, South San Francisco, CA 332 Avalon Drive, South San Francisco, CA 443 Yellowstone Drive, South San Francisco, CA 463 Alhambra Road, South San Francisco, CA

Project Sponsor:	San Francisco International Airport
Applicant:	Audrey Park – (650) 821-7844
	audrey.park@flysfo.com
	San Francisco International Airport, Bureau of 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, Citywide Director For: Rich Hillis, Director of Planning

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

Project Description

As part of its Noise Insulation Program (NIP) the San Francisco International Airport (SFO) proposes to acquire noise easements on 65 parcels located in San Mateo County and to provide acoustic noise insulation treatments on the owners' properties in return for the avigation easements.

The California Administrative Code requires airports to eliminate incompatible land uses within a noise impact boundary unless the airport applied for or received a variance. California Administrative Code § 5014 (21 CA ADC § 5014) states that residences are not compatible with the noise impact area unless an avigation easement for aircraft noise has been acquired by the airport proprietor. The proposed acquisition of permanent avigation easements for aircraft noise aka "noise easement" from several private property owners allows SFO to meet the code requirements. A noise easement conveys the right to subject the property to noise, vibration, fumes, dust, and fuel particle emissions associated with normal airport activity.

The SFO Noise Insulation Program provides acoustical improvements to single-family residential properties inside the 65-dB noise contour, or a specific area where the average daily aircraft noise level is equal to or greater than 65 decibels as designated by the FAA. These improvements are paid mainly with Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) grants and offered at no cost to eligible property owners. Acoustic treatment is performed on eligible properties in exchange for signed noise easements.

There are a total of 60 easement parcels under this application. Homeownership participation in the NIP is voluntary and only properties meeting eligibility requirements established by the FAA may apply.

Environmental Review

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 10 MINIMIZE THE IMPACT OF NOISE ON AFFECTED AREAS.

Policy 10.3 Construct physical barriers to reduce noise transmission from heavy traffic carriers.

The project will provide acoustic noise insulation treatments to reduce the impacts of airport operations on indoor noise levels.

OBJECTIVE 11

PROMOTE LAND USES THAT ARE COMPATIBLE WITH VARIOUS TRANSPOTATION 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 project meets the requirements of the California Administrative Code by addressing issues related to compatibility between airport operation noise and proposed new land use developments.

TRANSPORTATION ELEMENT

OBJECTIVE 2

USE THE TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM AS A MEANS FOR GUIDING DEVELOPMENT AND IMPROVING THE ENVIRONMENT.

Policy 2.2

Reduce pollution, noise and energy consumption.

The proposed project plans to mitigate against noise pollution from SFO operations at the 65 parcels. It will provide acoustic noise insulation treatments to reduce noise intrusion and improve the quality of life of affected residents.

OBJECTIVE 4

IMPROVEMENT OF THE NEIGHBORHOOD ENVIRONMENT TO INCREASE PERSONAL SAFETY, COMFORT, PRIDE AND OPPORTUNITY

Policy 4.1

Protect residential areas from the noise, pollution and physical danger of excessive traffic.

The proposed project plans to mitigate against noise pollution from SFO operations in a residential area. It will provide acoustic noise insulation treatments to reduce noise intrusion and increase personal comfort

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 easements 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. It will protect residents within and near the airplane path of travel from noise pollution.

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:

-

Noise Exposure Map General Plan Referral Properties