

# SocketSite™

May 30, 2013

## Permits For Tishman's 201 Folsom Street Towers Project Issued



As we first reported last month, while Tishman Speyer was still waiting for final sign-off on the permits to start construction on [their 201 Folsom Street Project](#), according to a plugged-in source, [the timing was imminent](#).

Yesterday, building permits for the two towers, two 8-story midrises, and a podium building to rise on the site pictured above were approved and issued. While now waiting for sign-off on the permit to commence excavation and shoring, [the building\(s\) should soon begin](#).

- [The Arquitectonica Redesigned 201 Folsom Street Rendering Scoop](#) [SocketSite]
- [201 Folsom Street Timing: Immediately \(Upon Approval Of Permits\)](#) [SocketSite]
- [Timing For Tishman's 201 Folsom Street Towers: Imminent](#) [SocketSite]

## Comments from "Plugged In" Readers

yay!!!

Posted by: lyqwyd at May 30, 2013 10:05 AM

Great news! Let's hope the retail on the ground floor is something along the lines of a cafe, restaurant or grocery store and not a dental office like the current tenant at the base of 301 Main (San Francisco Surgical Arts). I'd even be ok with a bank or a small CVS/Walgreens type of store. I take it the developer decides. Is there any input or vote from the HOA? And, whatever happened to the cafe that was "coming soon" at the base of the 338 Spear street tower? That sign has been up for at least 3 years now! On a side note, I'm a big fan of the Warriors relocating to the nearby piers.

Posted by: infinity resident at May 30, 2013 10:42 AM

Great to see more density at this location - despite the Bay Guardian's whining this week. More density = demand for cafes and neighborhood serving retail; less need for dentist offices at ground level.

Posted by: Mike at May 30, 2013 11:27 AM

Because it has encouraged retail on the ground floor of most new projects (those on Harrison seem to be an exception), San Francisco has a lot of retail space that can't be immediately rented right now. I'm sure this developer will rent to whomever he can get (except perhaps something "discount" that doesn't fit an upscale image).

By the way, guesses: Does "immediately" (as in "begin construction immediately") mean more like next week or more like maybe by the end of the year?

Posted by: BTinSF at May 30, 2013 1:47 PM

BTinSF, It all depends when the developer gets back to the DBI planchecker for the shoring permit.

The Site Permit approval does not allow for any construction or demolition and has a 15 day appeals period.

Posted by: james at May 30, 2013 3:52 PM

Happy to see these towers go up. Agree with Infinity resident above that the area needs more density and development.

@Mike, what is the SFBG complaining about? They prefer a parking lot over housing?

Posted by: sfresident at May 30, 2013 3:54 PM

sfresident,

the SFBG article stated that the 200k additional "rich" people in SF by 2040 will drive out the majority of the low income residents. Also it will result in a transit and auto traffic nightmare and that there will not be enough schools, parks, utilities, firefighters, police and healthcare to handle the growth.

Posted by: anon at May 30, 2013 4:23 PM

@anon

It won't if you actually build housing for those additional people.

Posted by: GL at May 30, 2013 5:42 PM

So SFBG's argument is that increasing supply of housing will drive out low income residents?

I would think exactly the opposite; keeping a restricted supply of housing in the midst of a growing economy would only drive pricing up, thereby resulting in low income people being replaced.

Or perhaps SFBG believes SF should restrict all new development and progress in the city so that leading companies and their employees want to move out, leaving a second tier shell of a city left. But hey, at least they'll be "affordable" housing. Detroit has a lot of "affordable" housing. Maybe we could try to emulate it.

SFBG is irrelevant, both as a business and as a voice of SF residents.

Posted by: sfresident at May 30, 2013 6:02 PM

What's wrong with displacing those who absorb and use tax money with those who pay it? With another 200,000 taxpaying residents and a lot fewer homeless (and other users of resources), San Francisco could be a paradise. Even the affluent will use public transportation if it's clean and runs on time, is not packed with the unwashed and if driving and parking are really as bad as the BG warns. Just imagine being able to eat an alfresco meal in San Francisco without being panhandled.

Posted by: BTinSF at May 30, 2013 9:56 PM

BTinSF -- Amen!

Posted by: OP at May 31, 2013 8:04 AM

SF seems to be split into two worlds.

One of residents who are driving the economic growth engine of the city and are pro development & improvements, and one of residents who have been left out of the growth and want to stop development so they have a chance to hang on.

As unpleasant as it may sound to some, SF is a very expensive city, and is therefore not a great option for those on low incomes. No amount of public policy is going to "fix" that.

When I see the random new generation hippie wandering around the city lamenting high rents, I can only imagine they came from somewhere like Iowa and had some romanticized vision of SF still being a 60s era "Haight Ashbury" scene of easy living. The SFBG voice is rooted in a city that no longer exists.

SF is moving forward. Those who don't like it have the option to move. Stopping continued development and growth of the city is simply not going to work.

Posted by: sfresident at May 31, 2013 11:55 AM

**UPDATE:** [T-Minus Two Days For Towering Folsom Street Project To Begin](#)

---

[http://www.socketsite.com/archives/2013/05/tishmans\\_201\\_folsom\\_towers\\_permit\\_issued\\_let\\_the\\_build.html](http://www.socketsite.com/archives/2013/05/tishmans_201_folsom_towers_permit_issued_let_the_build.html)