

SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING COMMISSION

DRAFT – Meeting Minutes

Commission Chambers, Room 400
City Hall, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Thursday, September 3, 2015
12:00 p.m.
Regular Meeting

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Fong, Wu, Antonini, Hillis Johnson, Moore, Richards

THE MEETING WAS CALLED TO ORDER BY PRESIDENT FONG AT 12: 10 P.M.

STAFF IN ATTENDANCE: John Rahaim – Planning Director, Chris Townes, Nicholas Foster, Alex Kirby, Rich Sucre, Timothy Johnston, Audrey Desmuke, Britany Bendix, Don Lewis, Tina Chang, Kevin Guy, and Jonas P. Ionin – Commission Secretary

SPEAKER KEY:

- + indicates a speaker in support of an item;
- indicates a speaker in opposition to an item; and
- = indicates a neutral speaker or a speaker who did not indicate support or opposition

A. CONSIDERATION OF ITEMS PROPOSED FOR CONTINUANCE

The Commission will consider a request for continuance to a later date. The Commission may choose to continue the item to the date proposed below, to continue the item to another date, or to hear the item on this calendar.

1. [2015-000988CWP](#) (C. FLORES: (415) 558-6473)
PROPOSED COMMISSION-SPONSORED INTERIM CONTROLS RELATED TO THE MISSION ACTION PLAN (MAP) 2020 - Pursuant to Planning Code Section 306.7(e), on July 9, 2015 the Planning Commission initiated **Interim Controls in the Mission District**. The interim controls are intended to make explicit the Commission's expectation for a dialogue about affordability; allow time for analysis of affordable housing needs; assess sites for affordable housing production; and stem the loss of existing income protected units while

maintaining production, distribution, and repair (PDR) capacity in PDR zoned lands and preserving vital community resources. The proposed controls would require a Conditional Use authorization for certain projects which result in any of the following: 1) the loss of more than one rent-controlled dwelling unit; or 2) the production of five or more dwelling units; or 3) demolition or conversion of certain assembly, recreation, arts and entertainment or institutional uses. The area proposed for interim controls is generally defined by the following boundaries: 13th and Division Streets to Mission Street, to Cesar Chavez Street, to Potrero Avenue, and back to 13th and Division Streets—except that the Mission Street boundary would include any parcel with a property line on either side of Mission Street. The interim controls would be proposed for a period of six months. At this hearing the Commission may amend and adopt the interim controls.

Preliminary Recommendation: TBD

(Continued from Regular Meeting of August 6, 2015)

(Proposed for Continuance to September 10, 2015)

SPEAKERS: None
ACTION: Continued to September 24, 2015
AYES: Fong, Wu, Hillis, Johnson, Moore, Richards
ABSENT: Antonini

B. CONSENT CALENDAR

All matters listed hereunder constitute a Consent Calendar, are considered to be routine by the Planning Commission, and may be acted upon by a single roll call vote of the Commission. There will be no separate discussion of these items unless a member of the Commission, the public, or staff so requests, in which event the matter shall be removed from the Consent Calendar and considered as a separate item at this or a future hearing

2. [2008.0091E](#) (T. JOHNSTON: (415) 575-9035)
SAN FRANCISCO WESTSIDE RECYCLED WATER PROJECT - Certification of the Final Environmental Impact Report. The proposed project, which is a component of the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) Water System Improvement Program, involves the construction and operation of a recycled water treatment plant within the SFPUC's Oceanside Water Pollution Control Plant (WPCP) located near the intersection of Great Highway and Skyline Boulevard. The plant would have an operational capacity to serve peak-day demands of up to 5 million gallons per day (mgd) (or 2 mgd annual average) to provide recycled water to be used primarily for irrigation of Golden Gate Park, Lincoln Park, and portions of the Presidio. Other project components include new and upgraded pump stations in Golden Gate Park at the existing Central Reservoir site, sub-surface storage facilities at the Oceanside WPCP and Central Reservoir, and approximately 8 miles of in-street pipelines located within Skyline Boulevard, Sloat Boulevard, 37th Avenue, Vicente Street, 36th Avenue, Lawton Street, 34th Avenue, Middle West Drive, Overlook Drive, John F. Kennedy Drive, Transverse Drive, Crossover Drive, 25th Avenue, Cabrillo Street, Clement Street, 24th Avenue, Anza Street, 16th Avenue, Lake Street, Oak Street, and 14th Avenue. These pipelines would connect the recycled water treatment plant to Golden Gate Park, Lincoln Park and the Presidio.

NOTE: The public hearing on the Draft EIR is closed. The public comment period for the Draft Supplemental EIR ended on May 4, 2015. Public comment will be received when the

item is called during the hearing. However, comments submitted may not be included in the Final EIR.

Preliminary Recommendation: Certify the Environmental Impact Report

SPEAKERS: = Michelle Flores – Staging area behind the zoo. Construction mitigation
ACTION: After being pulled off of Consent, hearing and closing public comment; Certified the FEIR
AYES: Fong, Antonini Hillis, Johnson, Moore, Richards
ABSENT: Wu
MOTION: 19442

- 3a. [2015-007190GPR](#) (A. DESMUKE: (415) 575-9136)
SAN FRANCISCO WESTSIDE RECYCLED WATER PROJECT - Consideration of **Adoption of Findings under the California Environmental Quality Act** for the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) Water System Improvement Program, involves the construction and operation of a recycled water treatment plant within the SFPUC's Oceanside Water Pollution Control Plant (WPCP) located near the intersection of Great Highway and Skyline Boulevard.

Preliminary Recommendation: Adopt Findings

SPEAKERS: = Michelle Flores – Staging area behind the zoo. Construction mitigation
ACTION: Adopted Findings as amended to include: "through 2018" on page 30 of the DRAFT Motion
AYES: Fong, Wu, Antonini Hillis, Johnson, Moore, Richards
MOTION: 19443

- 3b. [2015-007190GPR](#) (A. DESMUKE: (415) 575-9136)
SAN FRANCISCO WESTSIDE RECYCLED WATER PROJECT - Consideration of **General Plan Referral** pursuant to Section 4.105 of the Charter and Section 2A.53 of the Administrative Code of the City and County of San Francisco, and making Planning Code Section 101.1(b) findings recommending General Plan conformity findings for the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) San Francisco Westside Recycled Water Project.

Preliminary Recommendation: Adopt a Resolution finding the project, on balance, in conformity with the General Plan.

SPEAKERS: Same as Item 3a.
ACTION: Adopted a Resolution recommending Approval
AYES: Fong, Wu, Antonini Hillis, Johnson, Moore, Richards
RESOLUTION: 19444

C. COMMISSION MATTERS

4. Consideration of Adoption:
- [Draft Minutes for August 6, 2015](#)

SPEAKERS: None
ACTION: Adopted
AYES: Fong, Wu, Hillis, Johnson, Moore, Richards
ABSENT: Antonini

- [Draft Minutes for August 13, 2015](#)

SPEAKERS: None
ACTION: Continued to September 10, 2015
AYES: Fong, Wu, Hillis, Johnson, Moore, Richards
ABSENT: Antonini

5. Commission Comments/Questions

- Inquiries/Announcements. Without discussion, at this time Commissioners may make announcements or inquiries of staff regarding various matters of interest to the Commissioner(s).
- Future Meetings/Agendas. At this time, the Commission may discuss and take action to set the date of a Special Meeting and/or determine those items that could be placed on the agenda of the next meeting and other future meetings of the Planning Commission.

Commissioner Richards:

Three weeks was a long time to be away and I've actually got a lot of reading done. Again this is my first – my one year on the Commission, I actually haven't missed one meeting so I guess I must be having some fun. We got Mission Promise Neighborhood document from MEDA in our e-mail, I know is online, and if you go to Meda.org, a really interesting read on the state of the Mission in terms of the households, the number of children, what they're trying to do with this report is tie the fate of the children, to the education level, to the advancement, to the betterment of the neighborhood. I think anybody who really wants to take a look and understand what is going on the Mission, specifically as it relates to children and how they learn, this is a really good document to look at. There is also what was going around last week and came up by Kathleen McClay on displacement area, displacement forecast in different neighborhoods in the Bay Area. There is an interactive map that is associated with this, you can actually hover your mouse or your pointer over it. You can see exactly the percent chance of displacement is. It is really an incredibly powerful tool, she comes I believe from the UC Berkeley, she worked with Karen Chappell, so it is News.Berkley.edu. You can find this document and the map or just search for displacement -- urban displacement project map on the web, incredible read. A couple of other things, I guess looking towards the future, in Sunday August 16th Chronicle, they talk about driving urban design in the future, where we actually have driverless vehicles, and it actually talks about land use and planning that's been tailored to meet needs of cars that are driven by people and when you actually start forecasting when you have driverless cars that pickup people and drop them off, when they need to be taken somewhere, you actually have a lot of additional space that you could use for other things, really good read on that. Another enormously good read, was the Atlantic Monthly – August, they talked about the future of work whether actually work is going away. The point that was being made clearly is it pertains to planning is, in a couple more economic cycles, we are going to have a lot higher unemployment because we are going to have less use for workers. It says here, consider just how fundamentally the work has shaped America's geography, today's coastal cities were a jumble of office buildings and residential spaces. Both are expensive and tightly constrained, but the decline of work would make many office buildings actually unnecessary. What might this mean for the vibrancy of urban areas? Would office space yield seamlessly to apartments drawing people to live more affordably in city centers, leaving cities themselves just as lively or not? Or would we see vacant shells and spreading blight? Really good article, but we're talking about probably 30, 40, 50 years, two more economic cycles into the

future, but how it pertains to future planning, I think, is a really good read for somebody, I have this and it is online as well. A couple of other things in the Chronicle, while I was away, talks about wireless antennas and the public outrage over the fact that we have to approve - apparently there's a bill in Sacramento- approve within 150 days or not; really good read and I think Mr. Masry probably when he comes next time for these antennas will maybe give us a really quick brief on that. Bear with me here again, three weeks is lot of reading to do. In today's paper, John King talks about—today's Chronicle—he talks about the danger of having a mono-culture here in the city, where in terms of how it actually drives economic performance and culture. Cities need a variety of economic engines all chugging away differently; ones kicking in high gear at different times when other ones are running low, rather than having a single turbo charge sector that sends everybody to seek cover when they can. Really good point, I thing John King was making in the repositioning of one of the building downtown. I believe it was the Chancery Building, good read. Lastly, I see that Apple is renting out the Bill Graham Auditorium on Monday for its announcement. I see they got parking spaces for \$9 a day, I wonder how we could get those. That was my last item.

Commissioner Antonini:

Well over the break I took a trip to Pittsburgh. I was there for four days, sorry I couldn't bring home a Giant win while I was there, but it was very interesting to see that city and they do a lot of good things. They have baseball and football stadiums right next to each other with a short walk over the bridge from downtown. They also have a large arena, even though they don't have a pro-basketball team, they do have a hockey team. They also have lots of hospitals and both of those things seem to work very well together. It's interesting because Pittsburgh was at one time rated the second richest city in the United States, as far as people with wealth. At one time, they had two-thirds of a million, about 660,000 people, the population is now 310,000. It maybe up some that was a figure from 2010. You are seeing things getting better and new buildings being built downtown and residential buildings being built downtown in Pittsburgh. But the other thing that is kind of sad when we compare it to San Francisco, it's a very clean city. You don't see garbage all over the place; I did not see a single individual passed out on the street or incapacitated. I only saw two pan handlers the whole time and that was walking across the bridge from the stadium back to downtown after the Giants/Pirates game. So I don't know what it is, but they seem to be doing something right and it's refreshing to see an area that seems to be able to keep the city clean. I did not see all 55 square miles of Pittsburgh; it's around San Francisco's size, a little bigger and I'm sure that Commissioner Richards, who is from Pittsburgh and also was there, might be able to explain some of the things, but it was an interesting trip to see, especially a city that's lost population, has lower income levels and higher unemployment than San Francisco manages to do a better job with some of the social issues that we seem to be challenged with.

Commissioner Johnson:

Thanks very much, I'll keep it quick. So, yes you were talking about Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. What I didn't know was Commissioner Richards you're from there. I used to work there --- there is a lot of dilapidated areas in Pittsburgh. I think Commissioner Antonini might not have seen those or bypassed those neighborhoods. On the Atlantic article, fantastic, I think the issue is not we're not going to have workers just that were going to have lots of different activities. So it's not all going to be residential, it's going to be people doing other stuff; we need to figure out what that other stuff will be and then just really quick, my one comment, I know that in the working world you always want to give feedback in a timely and relevant manner so that people can act on it. Unfortunately, we haven't had a Commissioner's Comments and Questions period, a two weeks break and I wasn't here for another week, third week. But, I noticed a couple of hearings where we've had staff or a project sponsor bring information to us that we were shocked by, in a hearing and I find that, I'm

going to use the word unacceptable. The one example that I will give, is when we were talking about the project in Mission and we find out that the project sponsor had invoked the Permit Streamlining Act in the hearing. And we didn't know that before and it really impacted our ability to make a decision about potentially continuing and order of operations of some of the other things that we're continuing and that's not the first time it has happened. I normally praise Planning staff and Director, and I continue to do so. I think you guys do great work, but I wanted to take the first opportunity I had in the Commissioner's Comments and Questions to bring that up as something that I do find a little bit of a negative, and I hope we can alleviate issues like that in the future because I thought it was unacceptable that the entire Commission was surprised by that fact in that hearing. It has happened in a less shocking manner, but it has happened with other items as well.

6. [ACTION ITEMS LIST](#) – Discussion and prioritization.

SPEAKERS: None

ACTION: Reviewed and Prioritized

D. DEPARTMENT MATTERS

7. Director's Announcements

Director Rahaim:

Welcome back Commissioners. I won't give you a detailed report on my travels over the last few weeks, but suffice to say, the travels were excellent and at some point we could have more detailed conversation about it. If I may comment Commissioner Johnson on your last item, I agree there was, that particular item in particular that took us all by surprise so we need to do a better job of informing you when those things come up. Although, in that case there were also some legal issues we needed to work out as well. But we will do a better job in getting that kind of information to you in advance. I'll close my report there in the interest of time.

8. Review of Past Events at the Board of Supervisors, Board of Appeals and Historic Preservation Commission

None

E. GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT – 15 MINUTES

At this time, members of the public may address the Commission on items of interest to the public that are within the subject matter jurisdiction of the Commission except agenda items. With respect to agenda items, your opportunity to address the Commission will be afforded when the item is reached in the meeting. Each member of the public may address the Commission for up to three minutes.

SPEAKERS: Donald Dussoff – A better SF
George Schuttish – Rooftop penthouse – minimally visible
Katherine Hans Von Rotes Schill Ziller – Build more housing
Sue Hestor – Notice issues

F. DISCRETIONARY REVIEW CALENDAR

The Commission Discretionary Review Hearing Procedures provide for presentations by staff; followed by the DR requestor team; followed by public comment opposed to the project; followed by the project sponsor team; followed by public comment in support of the project. Please be advised that the DR requestor and project sponsor teams include: the DR requestor and sponsor or their designee, lawyers, architects, engineers, expeditors, and/or other advisors.

9. [2015-000685DRP](#) (C. TOWNES: (415) 575-9195)
548 RHODE ISLAND STREET - west side between 18th and Mariposa Streets; Lot 001H in Assessor's Block 4009 - Request for **Discretionary Review** of Building Permit Application No. 2015.01.16.5908 proposing a one-story vertical third floor addition, a two-story horizontal rear addition and interior/exterior alterations to an existing single family residence within a RH-2 (Residential, House, Two-Family) Zoning District and 40-X Height and Bulk District. This action constitutes the Approval Action for the project for purposes of CEQA, pursuant to Section 31.04(h) of the San Francisco Administrative Code.
 Staff Analysis: Abbreviated Discretionary Review
 Preliminary Recommendation: Do Not Take Discretionary Review and Approve
 (Continued from Regular Meeting of August 6, 2015)

SPEAKERS: - Jeremy McAmun – DR requestor presentation
 - Henry Shapiro – Poor design
 - (M) Speaker – Does not meet neighborhood character
 - Libby Silverman – Opposition
 + Project Sponsor – Sponsor presentation
 + Jesse Murray – Support, valuable addition
 + Josh McAdam – Family needs, shortage of housing
 - (M) Speaker – DR rebuttal, expedited process, inappropriate massing
 + (M) Speaker – Sponsor rebuttal

ACTION: Took DR and Approved with modifications:
 1. Reduce the height of the building by 18 inches; and
 2. Remove the parapet

AYES: Fong, Wu, Antonini, Hillis, Richards
 NAYES: Johnson, Moore
 DRA No: 0431

10. [2014-002235DRM](#) (N. FOSTER: (415) 575-9167)
214 CALIFORNIA STREET - north side of California Street between Front and Battery Streets; Lot 007 in Assessor's Block 0237 – **Mandatory Discretionary Review** pursuant to Planning Code Section 202 for the application to allow for a Medical Cannabis Dispensary (MCD) to operate at the subject property within the C-3-O (Downtown Office) Zoning District and 75-X Height and Bulk District. This action constitutes the Approval Action for the project for the purposes of CEQA, pursuant to San Francisco Administrative Code Section 31.04(h).
 Staff Analysis: Full Discretionary Review
 Preliminary Recommendation: Take Discretionary Review and Approve with Modifications.
 (Continued from Regular Meeting of August 6, 2015)

SPEAKERS: + Brandan Hallinan – Sponsor presentation
 - Paul Richards – 244 California Street, opposition, tenants code of conduct

+ David Goldman – MCD's in the Financial District
 + Michael Cohen – Support
 + (M) Speaker – Support
 + Paul Kinnely – Quality control
 + Justina Perry – Regulated delivery services
 + Nicholas Feelies – Clustering mitigation
 ACTION: Took DR and Approved with Conditions as amended to include:
 Sponsor to work with Staff re: supervision of back alley and mitigation of any
 negative activity, by incorporating safety measures, lighting and/or activation.
 AYES: Fong, Wu, Hillis, Johnson, Moore, Richards
 NAYES: Antonini
 DRA No: 0432

G. REGULAR CALENDAR

The Commission Hearing Procedures provide for presentations by staff; followed by the project sponsor team; followed by public comment for and against the proposal. Please be advised that the project sponsor team includes: the sponsor(s) or their designee, lawyers, architects, engineers, expeditors, and/or other advisors.

11. [2014-000040CUA](#) (A. KIRBY 415.575.9133)
1126 IRVING STREET - north side of Irving Street between Funston and 12th Avenues; Lot 021 in Assessor's Block 1738 - Request for **Conditional Use Authorization**, pursuant to Planning Code Sections 303, 317 and 730.37, to allow the demolition of a two-story-over-garage, two-unit building and the construction of a four-story, three-unit building with ground-floor commercial space. The property is within the Inner Sunset NCD (Neighborhood Commercial District) and 40-X Height and Bulk District. This action constitutes the Approval Action for the project for the purposes of CEQA, pursuant to Section 31.04(h) of the San Francisco Administrative Code.
 Preliminary Recommendation: Approve with Conditions
 (Continued from Regular Meeting of August 6, 2015)

SPEAKERS: + Craig Dawson – Project presentation
 + Jonathan Pearlman – Design presentation
 - Alan Chommers – Organized opposition
 - Kate Fritz – Letter of compromise
 + Van Obermoller – Mistakenly signed the opposition letter
 + Naomi Pratt – Housing crisis
 - Robin Orm – Die by a thousand cuts, let it be built
 + Robert Poole – Modest proposal
 Brian Shniro – Beauty is the eye of the beholder
 + Lena Emery – Create family housing
 + Patricia Contrera – Support
 + John Berry – Support
 + Charles Head – Support
 - Steve Williams – Violates General Plan priority policies
 + Frank Noto – Support, code compliant project
 + Jeremy Freelander – Support
 + Bonnie Jones – Support

- + Sherry Bochurt – Support, gaining on-street parking space
- + Tale Ridlock – Abides to the guidelines
- + (M) Speaker – Rent control and affordability
- + Omar Diaf – Not an eyesore, affordability, housing crisis
- + Annie Freeman – Support
- + Donald DUSsoff – Support
- + Dawn Ma – Support
- Date Salem – Smaller scale development
- Patrick Morris – Out of scale and not in character with neighborhood
- + Dennis Tsai – Sunset buildings not made of redwood. Single-family home not subject to rent control
- + (F) Speaker – Affordable family housing
- Tri Tam – No outreach

ACTION: After hearing and closing public comment; continued to November 5, 2015
 AYES: Wu, Antonini, Hillis, Johnson, Moore, Richards
 NAYES: Fong

12. [2014.0954C](#) (R. SUCRE: (415) 575-9108)
1314 FITZGERALD AVENUE AND 1409 EGBERT AVENUE - located on a rectangular lot bounded by Egbert Avenue, Jennings Street and Fitzgerald Avenue, Assessor's Block 4912, Lots 001, 002, and 016 - Request for **Planned Unit Development (PUD) - Conditional Use Authorization**, pursuant to Planning Code Sections 121.9, 303 and 304, to subdivide large lots within a PDR District, demolish six industrial buildings (approximately 27,170 square feet), and construct two new, 30-ft-tall, industrial buildings (collectively measuring 28,200 square feet). The proposed project would retain an existing industrial building (1324 Fitzgerald Street) and the mixed-use buildings with ground floor retail and approximately five dwelling units (1401 Egbert Avenue/2814-2822 Jennings Street; 2824-2836 Jennings Street; and, 1300-1306 Fitzgerald Avenue). Under the PUD, the project is seeking a modification to the off-street parking requirements, as required in Planning Code Section 151. The subject property is located within the PDR-1-B (Production, Distribution and Repair-Light Industrial Buffer) and PDR-2 (Core Production, Distribution and Repair-Bayview) Zoning District and 40-X Height and Bulk District. This action constitutes the Approval Action for the project for the purposes of CEQA, pursuant to San Francisco Administrative Code Section 31.04(h).
 Preliminary Recommendation: Approve with Conditions
 (Continued from Regular Meeting of August 6, 2015)

SPEAKERS: + Alice Barkley – Project presentation
 ACTION: Approved with Conditions
 AYES: Fong, Antonini, Hillis, Johnson, Moore, Richards
 ABSENT: Wu
 MOTION: 19441

- 13a. [2014.0567BC](#) (B. BENDIX: (415) 575-9114)
2101 MISSION STREET - southeast corner of the Mission and 17th Street intersection, Lot 091 in Assessor's Block 3575 - Request for **Office Development Authorization** pursuant to Planning Code Sections 320 and 321, for 48,660 gross square feet of office use from the Office Development Annual Limit. The subject property is located in the Mission Neighborhood Commercial Transit (NCT) Zoning District and 65-X Height and Bulk District.

This action constitutes the Approval Action for the project for the purposes of CEQA, pursuant to Section 31.04(h) of the San Francisco Administrative Code.

Preliminary recommendation: Approve with Conditions

(Continued from Regular Meeting of August 6, 2015)

- SPEAKERS:
- = Rochelle Aksel – Arts Commission submission
 - + Steve Vettel – Project presentation
 - Organized opposition (M) Speaker
 - (F) Speaker – Frustrated
 - + Tom Mikelson – Lessee
 - + Lane Steinmetz – Tax generation, employer
 - Paula Yamen – Displaced artists
 - (M) Speaker – Gentrification bomb
 - (F) Speaker – Mixed uses on all floors
 - Andy Vote – Mixed uses on all floors
 - + Corey Crayle – Safety plan
 - Patricia Kerman – Gentrification
 - Tracy Rosenberg – Catastrophic loss of PDR space
 - Kate Gibson – Redlick building letter
 - (M) Speaker – Evicted tenants
 - + Katherine Von Rusch – Cannot continue same path, safety issue
 - Andy Sevilla – Natural light and air
 - Kay Walker – Grey Panthers
 - Mary Sorenson – Gentrification loss of PDR
 - (F) Speaker – Need community art and culture space
 - Gabriel Medina – Displacement, artist space
 - (F) Speaker – Opposition
 - Rich Gerhardter – Threatens the Redstone
 - Margo Gomez – Displacement
 - John Shenbecker – Opposition
 - Kate Nichols – Talk turkey
 - (F) Speaker – Opposition
 - Tony Avitera – Gentrification
 - Sharon Stoyer – Studio with ventilation
 - (F) Speaker – Opposed, letter of determination
 - Chita – Vote NO
 - (F) Speaker – Administrative services
 - Cheyenne – misinterpretation
 - Denise Laws – Opposed
 - Venny Mackie – Techie support for the arts
 - Rich Hall – Trade shop w/o retail
 - (M) Speaker – Artist trade shop space
 - (M) Speaker – No need for displacement
 - Angelica Cobante – Spot zone office
 - Tony Robles – Keep the Mission a cultural neighborhood
 - Teiro Romero – Opposed
 - Peter Papadapollis – Administrative services definition
 - John Elberling – Deny small cap office space

- Hiroshi Fukuda – Opposition
 - (M) Speaker – Translation in truth
 - Erik Arguello – Big picture in the Mission, tech office
 - Jake – Supportive of artists
 - Gladys Soto – 20.8 unemployment rate in the Mission
- ACTION: Approved with Conditions as amended, reducing the Office Allocation to 46,660 square feet
- AYES: Fong, Antonini, Hillis, Johnson, Richards
- NAYES: Moore, Wu
- MOTION: 19445

- 13b. [2014.0567BC](#) (B. BENDIX: (415) 575-9114)
- 2101 MISSION STREET – southeast corner of the Mission and 17th Street intersection, Lot 091 in Assessor's Block 3575 – Request for **Conditional Use Authorization** pursuant to Planning Code Sections 121.2, 303, 320, 321, 736.65 and 736.70 to (1) establish a 25,601 gross square-foot administrative service use (d.b.a. PlanGrid), (2) establish a 8,311 gross square-foot administrative service use (d.b.a. Crowd Flower); (3) establish a 14,748 gross square-foot administrative service use (tenant to be determined); (4) establish a 6,266 gross square-foot trade shop (repair) use (d.b.a. Orion); and, (5) expand an existing trade shop (artisan craft) use from 10,000 gross square feet up to 25,215 gross square feet. The subject property is located in the Mission Neighborhood Commercial Transit (NCT) Zoning District and 65-X Height and Bulk District.
- Preliminary recommendation: Approve with Conditions
(Continued from Regular Meeting of August 6, 2015)

- SPEAKERS: Same as Item 13a.
- ACTION: Approved with Conditions as amended, increasing the Trade Shop use to approximately 34,500 square feet, including a finding that the Commission strongly encourages the Sponsor to provide no less than 21,000 square feet of the allocated Trade Shop area to artists
- AYES: Fong, Antonini, Hillis, Johnson, Richards
- NAYES: Moore, Wu
- MOTION: 19446

14. [2011.1122E](#) (D. LEWIS: (415) 575-9168)
- 75 HOWARD STREET - **Certification of the Final Environmental Impact Report.** The project site is located on the south side of Howard Street at the southwest intersection of Howard and Steuart Streets, Assessor's Block 3741, Lots 031 and 035. Since publication of the DEIR, the project sponsor has indicated that the proposed project, as described in the DEIR, is no longer the preferred project. The preferred project, which is similar to the Code Compliant Alternative that was analyzed under the DEIR, involves the demolition of the existing 550-space, eight-level, commercial parking structure, and construction of an approximately 20-story, 220-foot-tall, 333,864-gross-square-foot (gsf) residential, high-rise tower containing 133 units and approximately 5,824 gsf of retail use with 102 off-street parking spaces in a two-level underground garage accessed from Howard Street. The project site is located in a C-3-O(SD) – Downtown Office (Special Development) Use District and 200-S Height and Bulk District.
- Note: The public hearing on the Draft EIR is closed. The public comment period for the Draft EIR ended on September 23, 2013. Public comment will be received when the item is**

called during the hearing. However, comments submitted may not be included in the Final EIR.

Preliminary Recommendation: Certify the Final EIR
(Continued from Regular Meeting of July 23, 2015)

- SPEAKERS:**
- + Mark Sanchez – Project presentation
 - + Craig Hartman – Design presentation
 - + Mark Therriot – Near public transit, support
 - + Mat Regan – Affordable housing, housing stress
 - + Donald Dussoff – Support
 - + Rob Poole – Support, housing affordability
 - + Marcus Ismail – Support
 - + Katherine – Support
 - Hiroshi Fukuda – Too close to the Embarcadero
 - Sal Rockman – Traffic problems
 - + Tim Cohen – Should be taller
 - David Osgood – Widespread opposition
 - + John Schwartz – Paying affordable housing fees
 - + (F) Speaker – Transit oriented, contributes toward affordable housing
 - + (F) Speaker – Benefit renters
 - + Laura Clark – Move it forward
 - + Daniel Camp – Support
 - + Megan Heintz – Housing!
 - + (M) Speaker – Should have been taller
 - + Omar Dieb – Support
 - + Kyle Huey – Housing, retail
 - + (M) Speaker – Support
 - = Betty Mackie - \$200,000/year and cannot afford to live here, real affordable housing
 - + Marlene Morgan – Aprrove the code compliant project
 - Theresa Imperial – No on-site affordable housing
 - Chia Lottai – Luxury housing w/no on-site affordable housing
 - (F) Speaker – Opposed, remember what planning is about
 - = (M) Speaker – BMR was on-site is not the case, doesn't feel like SF
 - Diane Ruiz – Zero on-site affordable housing
 - John Elberling – The Department needs to start using the leverage it has
 - Chris Durazo – Rincon Hill stabilization fund. Model shaping the neighborhood for the long term
 - (M) Speaker – No on-site affordable housing
 - Sue Hestor – Redevelopment files, continuance
- ACTION:** Certified EIR
- AYES:** Wu, Fong, Antonini, Hillis, Johnson, Richards
- RECUSED:** Moore
- MOTION:** 19447

- 15a. [2011.1122XVCUA](#) (T. CHANG: (415) 575-9197)
75 HOWARD STREET PROJECT - South side of Howard Street at the southwest intersection of Howard and Steuart Streets, Assessor's Block 3741, 035 – Request for **Acceptance of Delegation of Authority** from the Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure (OCII)

pursuant to Sections 33128 and 33205 of the California Health and Safety Code, which provides OCII access to Planning Department services and the authority to delegate to the Planning Department certain of OCII's powers and functions with respect to the redevelopment of the 337 square-foot triangular parcel on the southeast corner of the subject property which currently falls under the Rincon Point – South Beach Redevelopment Plan. The project site is located in a C-3-O(SD) – Downtown Office (Special Development) Use District and a 200-S Height and Bulk District. This action constitutes the Approval Action for the project for purposes of CEQA, pursuant to Section 31.04(h) of the San Francisco Administrative Code.

Preliminary Recommendation: Accept Delegation of Authority
(Continued from Regular Meeting of July 23, 2015)

SPEAKERS: Same as Item 14
ACTION: Accept Delegation of Authority
AYES: Fong, Antonini, Hillis, Johnson, Richards
NAYES: Wu
RECUSED: Moore
MOTION: 19448

- 15b. [2011.1122E](#) (T. CHANG: (415) 575-9197)
75 HOWARD STREET PROJECT - South side of Howard Street at the southwest intersection of Howard and Steuart Streets, Assessor's Block 3741, Lots 031 and 035. Request for **Adoption of findings under the California Environmental Quality Act**, for a project involving the demolition of the existing 550-space, eight-level, commercial parking structure, and construction of an approximately 20-story, 220-foot-tall, 333,864-gross-square-foot (gsf) residential, high-rise tower containing 133 units and approximately 5,824 gsf of retail use with 102 off-street parking spaces in a two-level underground garage accessed from Howard Street. The project site is located in a C-3-O(SD) – Downtown Office (Special Development) Use District and a 200-S Height and Bulk District. This action constitutes the Approval Action for the project for purposes of CEQA, pursuant to Section 31.04(h) of the San Francisco Administrative Code.
Preliminary Recommendation: Adopt Findings
(Continued from Regular Meeting of July 23, 2015)

SPEAKERS: Same as Item 14
ACTION: Adopted CEQA Findings
AYES: Fong, Antonini, Hillis, Johnson, Richards
NAYES: Wu
RECUSED: Moore
MOTION: 19449

- 15c. [2011.1122XVCUA](#) (T. CHANG: (415) 575-9197)
75 HOWARD STREET PROJECT - South side of Howard Street at the southwest intersection of Howard and Steuart Streets, Assessor's Block 3741, Lots 031 and 035 – Request for **Determination of Compliance** pursuant to Planning Code Section 309, with exceptions to the requirements Floor Area Ratio pursuant to Planning Code Section 124, Rear Yard pursuant to Planning Code Section 134, Ground-Level Wind Currents in C-3 Districts pursuant to Planning Code Section 148, Upper Tower Extensions in S Districts pursuant to Planning Code Section 263.9, and Bulk Limits pursuant to Planning Code Section 270 and

272. The preferred project, which is similar to the Code Compliant Alternative that was analyzed under the DEIR, involves the demolition of the existing 550-space, eight-level, commercial parking structure, and construction of an approximately 20-story, 220-foot-tall, 333,864-gross-square-foot (gsf) residential, high-rise tower containing 133 units and approximately 5,824 gsf of retail use with 102 off-street parking spaces in a two-level underground garage accessed from Howard Street. The project site is located in a C-3-O(SD) – Downtown Office (Special Development) Use District and 200-S Height and Bulk District. This action constitutes the Approval Action for the project for purposes of CEQA, pursuant to Section 31.04(h) of the San Francisco Administrative Code.

Preliminary Recommendation: Approve with Conditions

(Continued from Regular Meeting of July 23, 2015)

SPEAKERS: Same as Item 14
ACTION: Approved with Conditions
AYES: Fong, Antonini, Hillis, Johnson, Richards
NAYES: Wu
RECUSED: Moore
MOTION: 19450

- 15d. [2011.1122XVCUA](#) (T. CHANG: (415) 575-9197)
75 HOWARD STREET PROJECT - South side of Howard Street at the southwest intersection of Howard and Steuart Streets, Assessor's Block 3741, Lots 031 and 035 – **Request for Conditional Use Authorization** for parking exceeding principally permitted amounts pursuant to Planning Code Section 151.1. The project proposes three parking spaces for each four dwelling units, requiring Conditional Use Authorization. The preferred project, which is similar to the Code Compliant Alternative that was analyzed under the DEIR, involves the demolition of the existing 550-space, eight-level, commercial parking structure, and construction of an approximately 20-story, 220-foot-tall, 333,864-gross-square-foot (gsf) residential, high-rise tower containing 133 units and approximately 5,824 gsf of retail use with 102 off-street parking spaces in a two-level underground garage accessed from Howard Street. The project site is located in a C-3-O(SD) – Downtown Office (Special Development) Use District and 200-S Height and Bulk District. This action constitutes the Approval Action for the project for purposes of CEQA, pursuant to Section 31.04(h) of the San Francisco Administrative Code.
Preliminary Recommendation: Approve with Conditions
(Continued from Regular Meeting of July 23, 2015)

SPEAKERS: Same as Item 14
ACTION: Approved with Conditions as amended to include a finding that the Sponsor consider providing a park
AYES: Fong, Antonini, Hillis, Johnson, Richards
NAYES: Wu
RECUSED: Moore
MOTION: 19451

- 15e. [2011.1122XVCUA](#) (T. CHANG: (415) 575-9197)
75 HOWARD STREET PROJECT - South side of Howard Street at the southwest intersection of Howard and Steuart Streets, Assessor's Block 3741, Lots 031 and 035 – Request for **Variances** pursuant to Planning Code Sections 140 and 145.1, as the project does not meet

Exposure or Active Street Frontage requirements. The preferred project, which is similar to the Code Compliant Alternative that was analyzed under the DEIR, involves the demolition of the existing 550-space, eight-level, commercial parking structure, and construction of an approximately 20-story, 220-foot-tall, 333,864-gross-square-foot (gsf) residential, high-rise tower containing 133 units and approximately 5,824 gsf of retail use with 102 off-street parking spaces in a two-level underground garage accessed from Howard Street. The project site is located in a C-3-O(SD) – Downtown Office (Special Development) Use District and 200-S Height and Bulk District.

(Continued from Regular Meeting of July 23, 2015)

SPEAKERS: Same as Item 14

ACTION: ZA Closed the PH and indicated an intent to Grant

3:30 P.M.

The following item(s) will be considered after the time indicated. Items listed here may not be considered prior to the time indicated above. It is provided as a courtesy to limit unnecessary wait times.

16. [2011.0409](#) (K. GUY: (415) 558-6163)
925 MISSION STREET - ("5M PROJECT") - Informational Presentation - Multiple properties generally bounded by Mission Street to the north, Fifth Street to the east, and Howard Street to the south (Assessor Block 3725/Lots: 005, 006, 008, 009, 012, 042, 043, 044, 045, 046, 047, 076, 077, 086, 089, 090, 091, 093, 097, 098; air rights parcels 094, 099, and 100). The 5M Project proposes to demolish surface parking lots and four existing buildings, retain three existing buildings, and construct three new towers on the project site, with occupied building heights ranging from approximately 200 feet to 450 feet. The project includes approximately 821,300 square feet of residential uses (approximately 690 units), 807,600 square feet of office uses, and 68,700 square feet of other active ground floor uses (a mix of retail establishments, recreational and arts facilities, restaurants, workshops, and educational uses). The project would also include vehicular parking, bicycle parking, and loading facilities, private- and publicly-accessible open space, and streetscape and public-realm improvements. Topics to be discussed will include how the project relates to the context of the surrounding neighborhood and the urban form of the skyline, activation at the ground floor, and economic impacts of the project.
 Preliminary Recommendation: None – Informational

SPEAKERS: + Michael Therriot – Support
 = (M) Speaker – Change to the Filipino community
 = Bernadette Cee – Filipino community concerns
 = Ada Chan – Displacement of Filipino community
 = Judy Barbono – Continuance
 - Betty – District 6 becoming the biggest source of luxury housing
 - Mary – Filipino community
 - Michael Ng – No action be taken
 = Kathy Wolf – Homeless vets
 + (F) Speaker – Support for affordable housing
 + (F) Speaker – Support
 + Anna – Support

- (F) Speaker – Continuance
- + (F) Speaker – Support
- = (M) Speaker – Shadow and height
- Marlene Morgan – Edge of the building
- = Tony Robles – High end housing in SOMA. No action until December
- = Vivian Aurallejo – Crisis
- = (F) Speaker – No action until December
- = Luis Antonia – Consequences to existing residents
- Theresa Allala – Prejudice
- Chris D’Arazo – Delay voting
- = Brian Webster – Filipino community
- Sal Rachman – Further study, mitigation
- = Barbara Rachman – If you pay enough you can buy any exemptions you want. When did zoning become just a suggestion?
- = (M) Speaker – PROSAC recommendation to postpone the project until further study
- = (M) Speaker – Delay project
- = Theresa Imperial – Real economic study
- = Gale Medina – Extreme development
- Lisa Vicentine – Analysis of displacement
- = Peter Papadapollos – Negative impacts
- = Joseph Smoot – C-3 vs C-3-S
- (F) Speaker – Continue the project
- + (F) Speaker - Support 5M, affordable housing
- = Eric Arguello – Delay the project
- = Rick – Too much too fast

ACTION: None – Informational

H. PUBLIC COMMENT

At this time, members of the public may address the Commission on items of interest to the public that are within the subject matter jurisdiction of the Commission except agenda items. With respect to agenda items, your opportunity to address the Commission will be afforded when the item is reached in the meeting with one exception. When the agenda item has already been reviewed in a public hearing at which members of the public were allowed to testify and the Commission has closed the public hearing, your opportunity to address the Commission must be exercised during the Public Comment portion of the Calendar. Each member of the public may address the Commission for up to three minutes.

The Brown Act forbids a commission from taking action or discussing any item not appearing on the posted agenda, including those items raised at public comment. In response to public comment, the commission is limited to:

- (1) responding to statements made or questions posed by members of the public; or
- (2) requesting staff to report back on a matter at a subsequent meeting; or
- (3) directing staff to place the item on a future agenda. (Government Code Section 54954.2(a))

ADJOURNMENT – 12:14 A.M.