BOARD of SUPERVISORS

City Hall
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco 94102-4689
Tel. No. (415) 554-5184
Fax No. (415) 554-5163
TDD/TTY No. (415) 554-5227

MEMORANDUM

Date: January 17, 2024

To: Planning Department/Planning Commission

From: John Carroll, Assistant Clerk, Land Use and Transportation Committee

Subject: Board of Supervisors Legislation Referral - File No. 240001
Planning Code, Zoning Map - 68 Nantucket Avenue

☒ California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Determination
(California Public Resources Code, Sections 21000 et seq.)
☒ Ordinance / Resolution
☐ Ballot Measure

CEQA clearance under common sense exemption issued on 8/12/2021 (Case No. 2018-008802ENV)

02/14/2024

☐ Amendment to the Planning Code, including the following Findings:
(Planning Code, Section 302(b): 90 days for Planning Commission review)
☐ General Plan ☐ Planning Code, Section 101.1 ☐ Planning Code, Section 302

☐ Amendment to the Administrative Code, involving Land Use/Planning
(Board Rule 3.23: 30 days for possible Planning Department review)

☐ General Plan Referral for Non-Planning Code Amendments
(Charter, Section 4.105, and Administrative Code, Section 2A.53)
(Required for legislation concerning the acquisition, vacation, sale, or change in use of City property; subdivision of land; construction, improvement, extension, widening, narrowing, removal, or relocation of public ways, transportation routes, ground, open space, buildings, or structures; plans for public housing and publicly-assisted private housing; redevelopment plans; development agreements; the annual capital expenditure plan and six-year capital improvement program; and any capital improvement project or long-term financing proposal such as general obligation or revenue bonds.)

☐ Historic Preservation Commission
☐ Landmark *(Planning Code, Section 1004.3)*
☐ Cultural Districts *(Charter, Section 4.135 & Board Rule 3.23)*
☐ Mills Act Contract *(Government Code, Section 50280)*
☐ Designation for Significant/Contributory Buildings *(Planning Code, Article 11)*

Please send the Planning Department/Commission recommendation/determination to John Carroll at john.carroll@sfgov.org.

San Francisco Planning

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

CEQA Exemption Determination

PROPERTY INFORMATION/PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Project Address		Block/Lot(s)
68 NANTUCKET AVE		3144B027
Case No.		**Permit No.**
2018-008802ENV		
■ **Addition/ Alteration**	☐ **Demolition (requires HRE for Category B Building)**	☐ **New Construction**

Project description for Planning Department approval.

The project site (parcels 3144B/027A and 3144B/036A) is located on the northeast side of Nantucket Avenue on the block bounded by Nantucket Avenue, San Jose Avenue, Colonial Way, and the BART right-of-way/Highway 280 in the Outer Mission neighborhood. The 2,391-square-foot project site is a vacant lot adjacent to and just north of the residence at 62 Nantucket Avenue. The project involves the rezoning of the parcels from P (Public) to RH-1 (Residential-House, One Family). No development project is associated with this rezoning.

STEP 1: EXEMPTION TYPE

The project has been determined to be exempt under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

☐	**Class 1 - Existing Facilities.** Interior and exterior alterations; additions under 10,000 sq. ft.
☐	**Class 3 - New Construction.** Up to three new single-family residences or six dwelling units in one building; commercial/office structures; utility extensions; change of use under 10,000 sq. ft. if principally permitted or with a CU.
☐	**Class 32 - In-Fill Development.** New Construction of seven or more units or additions greater than 10,000 sq. ft. and meets the conditions described below: (a) The project is consistent with the applicable general plan designation and all applicable general plan policies as well as with applicable zoning designation and regulations. (b) The proposed development occurs within city limits on a project site of no more than 5 acres substantially surrounded by urban uses. (c) The project site has no value as habitat for endangered rare or threatened species. (d) Approval of the project would not result in any significant effects relating to traffic, noise, air quality, or water quality. (e) The site can be adequately served by all required utilities and public services.
☐	**Other** ____
■	**Common Sense Exemption (CEQA Guidelines section 15061(b)(3)).** It can be seen with certainty that there is no possibility of a significant effect on the environment.

STEP 2: ENVIRONMENTAL SCREENING ASSESSMENT

TO BE COMPLETED BY PROJECT PLANNER

☐	**Air Quality:** Would the project add new sensitive receptors (specifically, schools, day care facilities, hospitals, residential dwellings, and senior-care facilities within an Air Pollution Exposure Zone? Does the project have the potential to emit substantial pollutant concentrations (e.g. use of diesel construction equipment, backup diesel generators, heavy industry, diesel trucks, etc.)? (*refer to the Environmental*
☐	**Hazardous Materials:** ☐ **Maher or** ☐ **Cortese** Is the project site located within the Maher area or on a site containing potential subsurface soil or groundwater contamination and would it involve ground disturbance of at least 50 cubic yards or a change of use from an industrial use to a residential or institutional use? Is the project site located on a Cortese site or would the project involve work on a site with an existing or former gas station, parking lot, auto repair, dry cleaners, or heavy manufacturing use, or a site with current or former underground storage tanks? *if Maher box is checked, note below whether the applicant has enrolled in or received a waiver from the San Francisco Department of Public Health (DPH) Maher program, or if Environmental Planning staff has determined that hazardous material effects would be less than significant.* **Note that a categorical exemption shall not be issued for a project located on the Cortese List**
☐	**Transportation:** Does the project involve a child care facility or school with 30 or more students, or a location 1,500 sq. ft. or greater? Does the project have the potential to adversely affect transit, pedestrian and/or bicycle safety (hazards) or the adequacy of nearby transit, pedestrian and/or bicycle facilities? Would the project involve the intensification of or a substantial increase in vehicle trips at the project site or elsewhere in the region due to autonomous vehicle or for-hire vehicle fleet maintenance, operations or
☐	**Archeological Resources:** Would the project result in soil disturbance/modification greater than two (2) feet below grade in an archeological sensitive area or eight (8) feet in a non-archeological sensitive area? If yes, archeology review is required.
☐	**Subdivision/Lot Line Adjustment:** Does the project site involve a subdivision or lot line adjustment on a lot with a slope average of 20% or more? (*refer to the Environmental Information tab on https://sfplanninggis.org/PIM/*) **If box is checked, Environmental Planning must issue the exemption.**
☐	**Average Slope of Parcel = or > 25%, or site is in Edgehill Slope Protection Area or Northwest Mt. Sutro Slope Protection Area:** Does the project involve any of the following: (1) New building construction, except one-story storage or utility occupancy, (2) horizontal additions, if the footprint area increases more than 50%, or (3) horizontal and vertical additions increase more than 500 square feet of new projected roof area? (*refer to the Environmental Information tab on https://sfplanninggis.org/PIM/*) **If box is checked, a geotechnical report is likely required and Environmental Planning must issue the exemption.**
☐	**Seismic Hazard:** ☐ **Landslide or** ☐ **Liquefaction Hazard Zone:** Does the project involve any of the following: (1) New building construction, except one-story storage or utility occupancy, (2) horizontal additions, if the footprint area increases more than 50%, (3) horizontal and vertical additions increase more than 500 square feet of new projected roof area, or (4) grading performed at a site in the landslide hazard zone? *(refer to the Environmental Information tab on https://sfplanninggis.org/PIM/)* **If box is checked, a geotechnical report is required and Environmental Planning must issue the exemption.**

Comments and Planner Signature (*optional*): Jeanie Poling

Neighborhood notice of environmental review sent on 10/24/19. Project site is on the Maher map (subject to Health Code Article 22A), but no excavation is proposed.

STEP 3: PROPERTY STATUS - HISTORIC RESOURCE

TO BE COMPLETED BY PROJECT PLANNER

PROPERTY IS ONE OF THE FOLLOWING: *(refer to Property Information Map)*	
☐	**Category A:** Known Historical Resource. **GO TO STEP 5.**
■	**Category B:** Potential Historical Resource (over 45 years of age). **GO TO STEP 4.**
☐	**Category C:** Not a Historical Resource or Not Age Eligible (under 45 years of age). **GO TO STEP 6.**

STEP 4: PROPOSED WORK CHECKLIST

TO BE COMPLETED BY PROJECT PLANNER

Check all that apply to the project.	
☐	1. **Change of use and new construction.** Tenant improvements not included.
☐	2. **Regular maintenance or repair** to correct or repair deterioration, decay, or damage to building.
☐	3. **Window replacement** that meets the Department's *Window Replacement Standards*. Does not include storefront window alterations.
☐	4. **Garage work.** A new opening that meets the *Guidelines for Adding Garages and Curb Cuts*, and/or replacement of a garage door in an existing opening that meets the Residential Design Guidelines.
☐	5. **Deck, terrace construction, or fences** not visible from any immediately adjacent public right-of-way.
☐	6. **Mechanical equipment installation** that is not visible from any immediately adjacent public right-of-way.
☐	7. **Dormer installation** that meets the requirements for exemption from public notification under *Zoning Administrator Bulletin No. 3: Dormer Windows*.
☐	8. **Addition(s)** that are not visible from any immediately adjacent public right-of-way for 150 feet in each direction; does not extend vertically beyond the floor level of the top story of the structure or is only a single story in height; does not have a footprint that is more than 50% larger than that of the original building; and does not cause the removal of architectural significant roofing features.
Note: Project Planner must check box below before proceeding.	
■	Project is not listed. **GO TO STEP 5.**
☐	Project **does not conform** to the scopes of work. **GO TO STEP 5**.
☐	Project involves **four or more** work descriptions. **GO TO STEP 5.**
☐	Project involves **less than four** work descriptions. **GO TO STEP 6.**

STEP 5: ADVANCED HISTORICAL REVIEW

TO BE COMPLETED BY PRESERVATION PLANNER

Check all that apply to the project.	
■	1. **Reclassification of property status**. *(Attach HRER Part I)* ☐ Reclassify to Category A a. Per HRER b. Other *(specify)*: property is a vacant lot, no structures that would be age-eligible historic resources. ■ Reclassify to Category C *(No further historic review)*
☐	2. Project involves a **known historical resource (CEQA Category A)** as determined by Step 3 and conforms entirely to proposed work checklist in Step 4.
☐	3. **Interior alterations to publicly accessible spaces that do not** remove, alter, or obscure **character defining features**.
☐	4. **Window replacement** of original/historic windows that are not "in-kind" but are consistent with existing historic character.
☐	5. **Façade/storefront alterations** that do not remove, alter, or obscure character-defining features.

☐	6. **Raising the building** in a manner that does not remove, alter, or obscure character-defining features.
☐	7. **Restoration** based upon documented evidence of a building's historic condition, such as historic photographs, plans, physical evidence, or similar buildings.
☐	8. **Work consistent** with the *Secretary of the Interior Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties* (*Analysis required*):
☐	9. **Work compatible** with a historic district (Analysis required):
☐	10. **Work that would not materially impair** a historic resource (Attach HRER Part II).
Note: If ANY box in STEP 5 above is checked, a Preservation Planner MUST sign below.	
☐	**Project can proceed with exemption review**. The project has been reviewed by the Preservation Planner and can proceed with exemption review. **GO TO STEP 6.**
Comments (*optional*):	
Preservation Planner Signature:	Stephanie Cisneros

STEP 6: EXEMPTION DETERMINATION

TO BE COMPLETED BY PROJECT PLANNER

■	**Common Sense Exemption: Department staff reviewed the project and determined that there is no possibility of a significant effect on the environment. No further environmental review is required. The project is exempt under CEQA.**	
	Project Approval Action: Board of Supervisors approves rezoning	**Signature:** Jeanie Poling 08/12/2021
	Supporting documents are available for review on the San Francisco Property Information Map, which can be accessed at https://sfplanninggis.org/PIM/. Individual files can be viewed by clicking on the Planning Applications link, clicking the "More Details" link under the project's environmental record number (ENV) and then clicking on the "Related Documents" link. Once signed or stamped and dated, this document constitutes an exemption pursuant to CEQA Guidelines and Chapter 31 of the Administrative Code. In accordance with Chapter 31 of the San Francisco Administrative Code, an appeal of an exemption determination to the Board of Supervisors can only be filed within 30 days of the project receiving the approval action.	

STEP 7: MODIFICATION OF A CEQA EXEMPT PROJECT

TO BE COMPLETED BY PROJECT PLANNER

In accordance with Chapter 31 of the San Francisco Administrative Code, when a California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) exempt project changes after the Approval Action and requires a subsequent approval, the Environmental Review Officer (or his or her designee) must determine whether the proposed change constitutes a substantial modification of that project. This checklist shall be used to determine whether the proposed changes to the approved project would constitute a "substantial modification" and, therefore, be subject to additional

MODIFIED PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Modified Project Description:

DETERMINATION IF PROJECT CONSTITUTES SUBSTANTIAL MODIFICATION

Compared to the approved project, would the modified project:	
☐	Result in expansion of the building envelope, as defined in the Planning Code;
☐	Result in the change of use that would require public notice under Planning Code Sections 311 or 312;
☐	Result in demolition as defined under Planning Code Section 317 or 19005(f)?
☐	Is any information being presented that was not known and could not have been known at the time of the original determination, that shows the originally approved project may no longer qualify for the exemption?
If at least one of the above boxes is checked, further environmental review is required	

DETERMINATION OF NO SUBSTANTIAL MODIFICATION

☐	The proposed modification would not result in any of the above changes.

If this box is checked, the proposed modifications are exempt under CEQA, in accordance with prior project approval and no additional environmental review is required. This determination shall be posted on the Planning Department website and office and mailed to the applicant, City approving entities, and anyone requesting written notice. In accordance with Chapter 31, Sec 31.08j of the San Francisco Administrative Code, an appeal of this determination can

Planner Name:	**Date:**