General Plan Referral

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

Date:

July 23, 2018

Case No.

Case No. 2018-009952GPR

SFPUC Parcel 75 of the Alameda County Lands

Fax.

Reception:

415.558.6409

415.558.6378

Block/Lot No.:

Portion of APN 096-0100-028-00

Project Sponsor:

City and County of San Francisco Public Utilities

Commission

Planning Information: 415.558.6377

Applicant:

Dina Brasil

City and County of San Francisco Public Utilities

Commission

525 Golden Gate Avenue San Francisco, CA 94102

Staff Contact:

Maggie Wenger - (415) 575-9126

maggie.wenger@sfgov.org

Recommendation:

Finding the project, on balance, is in conformity with

the General Plan

Recommended

By:

John Rahaim, Director of Planning

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

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. The project is a property sale to Alameda County for a roadway easement and slope easement adjacent to Calaveras Road known as SFPUC Parcel 75 of the Alameda County Lands. The proposed easements total approximately 34,800 square feet. There is no change in use.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

The work proposed does not meet the definition of a project pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15378. No further CEQA review is required.

GENERAL PLAN COMPLIANCE AND BASIS FOR RECOMMENDATION

The project is a property sale to Alameda County and there is no change in use. 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:

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION ELEMENT

POLICY 7.4

Assure the correction of landslide and shore erosion conditions where it is in the public interest to do so.

The existing erosion and slide areas along the Ocean shore are within the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. It should be decided first whether all of these problems should be corrected or whether some should be left to the forces of nature. The erosion of Ocean Beach should be corrected through a program of dune stabilization, where feasible. In cases where dune stabilization is not possible, structural measures may need to be utilized. Any stabilization and restoration of these damaged areas, to increase their recreational value, should be undertaken as part of the Federal administration of this recreation area.

Elsewhere in the city, corrective steps should be taken at City expense or through special assessment to solve slide and erosion problems.

The land sale will allow Alameda County to repopen a road after a January 2017 landslide and subsequent road repair by SFPUC.

POLICY 7.5

Prohibit construction, as a general rule, on land subject to slide or erosion.

To minimize the hazard to life and property in areas subject to slide or erosion, building should be prohibited. Likewise utilities should not be installed in these areas because of the possibility of disruption.

The land sale will create an easement and prevent future construction on land subject to slide or erosion.

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. 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.
 - 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 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.

CASE NO. 2018-009952GPR SFPUC PARCEL 75 OF THE ALAMEDA COUNTY LANDS

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