

**Project Address:** 1140-1150 Harrison Street  
**Project Sponsor:** 1140 Harrison Associates LP  
**Date of SFHAC Review:** January 31st, 2018

### Grading Scale

1= Fails to meet project review guideline criteria  
 2= Meets some project review guideline criteria  
 3= Meets basic project review guideline criteria

4 = Exceeds basic project review guideline criteria  
 5 = Goes far beyond what is required

### Criteria for SFHAC Endorsement

1. The development must have been presented to the SFHAC Project Review Committee
2. The Project must score a minimum of 3/5 on any given guideline

<i><b>Guideline</b></i>	<i><b>Comments</b></i>	<i><b>Grade</b></i>
<b>Land Use</b>	Having seen the plans for the proposed project, the Committee was happy to see the previously industrial site (formerly the German Motors Collision Center) transition to residential use. In the midst of such a steep housing shortage, the highest and best use of the land is residential. 371 new homes is a significant addition to San Francisco, which sorely needs them.	<b>4</b>
<b>Affordability</b>	The proposed project employs an ex post facto financing mechanism, which was executed in an agreement with the city in 2016, according to the project team. Taking the opportunity to fulfill their financial plan as well as the priority of Supervisor Kim and the Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development is a creative solution, which preserved over 100 affordable homes.	<b>4</b>
<b>Density</b>	With 371 homes on the 1.74-acre site, which equates to a density of 213 du/ac, the proposed project is a good example of dense, but still friendly housing. The mix of 132 studios, 88 1BRs, 147 2BRs, and 4 3BRs is designed to serve a variety of residential needs within that density as well.	<b>4</b>
<b>Community Input</b>	According to the project team, they have had amicable interactions with neighbors and more than ten community groups, including Langston Street Neighbors, Western SoMa Voice, United Playaz, Veterans Equity Center, and SoMa Business Association. In response to the neighbors' requests, the team managed to: 1. incorporate the original retaining wall into the design 2. change homes' orientation such that they faced away from the Langston neighbors' backyards. The team showed they were extremely willing to work with neighbors to ensure the design was in everyone's best interest. They have also reached an agreement with the carpenters union, and maintain regular discussions with the MEPs.	<b>4</b>

<b>Urban Design</b>	The project team implemented several strong features of urban design throughout. Creating "flex units" on Harrison in response to a need for both work and residential space ensures they will be viable for a variety of circumstances and small business needs. Creation of an alley connecting Harrison Street to Folsom promotes area walkability and connectivity, and provides a community gathering space.	<b>4</b>
<b>Parking &amp; Alternative Transportation</b>	The project is well-located for service from Muni Bus Lines (Bayshore Expresses, 27 Bryant, 47 Van Ness, 12 Folsom-Pacific, and 19 Polk) that are within two blocks. This meshes well with the provision of 372 Class I and 48 Class II bicycle parking spaces to create mobility in the area. However, the committee did not believe the .47:1 parking ratio was necessary, as compared to the by-right standard of .25:1, although it is noted that their design stays below the limit of .75:1, which neighbors reportedly wanted.	<b>3</b>
<b>Environmental Features</b>	The proposed project meets the incredibly high environmental standards set by the city's code.	<b>3</b>
<b>Preservation</b>	Based on the team's report, the project evolved quite dramatically based on neighbor's desires for preservation. Working the retaining wall into the design at the neighbors' request was the prime example of these evolutions. Also, the design will leave the garage's original door as an entrance to the public space. Finally, the team will commission a local artist to use reclaimed brick to create an art piece for feature in the new alleyway.	<b>4</b>
<b>Additional Comments</b>	While the project is a strong example of good urbanism, the committee did not like the idea of having a public area closed in by doors on each end, as this mitigates the effectiveness of the corridor.	
<b>Final Comments</b>	Overall, SFHAC's Project Review Committee moves to endorse the project as proposed.	<b>3.8</b>

