



# SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

---

## General Plan Referral

*Date:* 8/13/2010  
*Case No.* Case No. 2010.0307R  
Sale of 35 & 45 Onondaga Ave  
City Owned Properties

*Block/Lot No.:* 6959/016, 6959/017  
*Project Sponsor:* Amy L. Brown, Director  
San Francisco Real Estate Department  
25 Van Ness Ave. Suite 400  
San Francisco, CA 94102

*Applicant:* Same as Above

*Staff Contact:* Aksel Olsen – (415) 558-6616  
[aksel.olsen@sfgov.org](mailto:aksel.olsen@sfgov.org)

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

*Recommended By:*   
John Rahaim, Director of Planning

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

Reception:  
415.558.6378

Fax:  
415.558.6409

Planning  
Information:  
415.558.6377

### PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The project reviewed is the sale of two properties currently owned by the Department of Public Health. Zoning reclassification is not being considered as a part of this application, which covers strictly the sale of said properties. If the properties are sold, the property owner(s) may seek to reclassify the properties.

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.

## SITE DESCRIPTION AND PRESENT USE

The subject properties include two buildings. The first, 35 Onondaga Ave, is zoned NC-3 (Moderate Scale Neighborhood Commercial) and is leased to St. Mary's Hospital. Saint Mary's uses the property for its Adult Day Health Care Program. The second parcel, 45 Onondaga Ave, zoned P (Public Use), is currently unoccupied.

## ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

On June 10, 2010, the Major Environmental Analysis of the Department determined that the Project is Categorical Exempt from Environmental Review under CEQA Guidelines Section 15312 – Surplus government property sales.

## GENERAL PLAN COMPLIANCE AND BASIS FOR RECOMMENDATION

The General Plan is focused more on property *use* than on transactions of ownership. The Project is the City's proposed disposal of two neighboring properties where the sale *itself* would not have an immediate and proximate effect on the uses. Even as the sale would not be a change of use, if the Project were approved, the properties would be sold to third parties, and uses could ultimately change subject to the regulations of the Planning Code.

The General Plan does encourage public uses and facilities, including affordable housing. We encourage the Department of Real Estate to consider this option without precluding the continued use for adult day care or other such services as allowed by the Planning Code.

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:

## HOUSING ELEMENT

### POLICY 1.5

**Support development of affordable housing on surplus public lands.**

Opportunities for housing development, particularly permanently affordable housing, on surplus vacant or underused public property should be aggressively pursued. The Planning Department should work with the Department of Real Estate, which manages the disposition of surplus public lands, to maintain a comprehensive and updated inventory of publicly held lands. City agencies should continue to identify and make available underutilized sites within

their jurisdiction. In some cases the air rights of these sites may be made available for housing without interfering with their current public use. Housing over public parking, transit facilities or water storage facilities are examples of such joint use. City property no longer needed for the purpose for which it was acquired or for some other public purpose, such as open space and recreation land, should be considered for rezoning, sale, or lease for development of permanently affordable housing.

*Surplus property should be considered for affordable housing and other uses consistent with the General Plan.*

#### **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, the sale of two neighboring properties, 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. The existing housing and neighborhood character will be not be negatively affected*

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.*

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

**GENERAL PLAN REFERRAL  
SALE OF 35 & 45 ONONDAGA ST.  
CITY OWNED PROPERTIES**

**CASE NO. 2010.0307R**

*The Project would not result in commuter traffic impeding MUNI's transit service, overburdening the streets or altering current neighborhood parking.*

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 significantly 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.*

7. That landmarks and historic buildings be preserved.

*The project would not result in the demolition of historic buildings.*

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.*

<b>RECOMMENDATION:</b>	<b>Finding the Project, on balance, in-conformity with the General Plan</b>
------------------------	---

cc: Jason Hinson, Dept of Real Estate

I:\Cases\2010\2010.0307\2010.0307R\_Sale\_35\_45\_OnondagaStreet.doc