

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, October 1, 2015
12:00 p.m.
Regular Meeting

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

THE MEETING WAS CALLED TO ORDER BY PRESIDENT FONG AT 12:11 P.M.

STAFF IN ATTENDANCE: John Rahaim – Planning Director, Carly Grob, Omar Masry, Teresa Ojeda, Colin Clarke, Doug Vu, Wade Wietgreffe, Christopher Thomas, 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. [2013.1390CUA](#) (R. SUCRE: (415) 575-9108)
1532 HARRISON STREET - located on the west side of Harrison Street between 12th and Norfolk Streets, Lot 056 in Assessor's Block 3521 - Request for a **Conditional Use Authorization**, pursuant to Planning Code Sections 121.1, 263.29, 303, and 823(c)(11), for

major developments requesting height bonuses and off-street parking for the project involving new construction of a seven-story, 65-ft tall, mixed-use building with 136 dwelling units, 1,463 square feet of ground floor commercial space, and 85 off-street parking spaces. Under the Conditional Use Authorization, the project is seeking modifications to the requirements for rear yard (Planning Code Section 134), open space (Planning Code Sections 135 and 823(c)(2)), off-street freight loading (Planning Code Section 152.1), and parking entrances and curb cuts (Planning Code Section 145.1). The project site is located within the WMUG (Western SoMa Mixed-Use General) Zoning District, Western SoMa Special Use District, and 55/65-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 September 17, 2015)
(Proposed for Continuance to October 8, 2015)

SPEAKERS: None
ACTION: Continued to October 8, 2015
AYES: Fong, Antonini, Hillis, Johnson, Moore, Richards
ABSENT: Wu

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. [2014-001083CUA](#) (C. GROB: (415) 575-9138)
1042 – 1044 JACKSON STREET - north side of Jackson Street on the east corner of Jackson Street and Auburn Street, Lot 013 in Assessor's Block 0181 - Request for **Conditional Use Authorization** pursuant to Planning Code Section 253 to exceed 40 feet in height in a RH District - The proposal is construct a two-story vertical addition to add one dwelling unit to an existing two-unit, two-story over basement building, within a Residential – House, Three Family (RH-3) District and 65-A 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 Hearing of September 17, 2015)
Note: On September 17, 2015, after hearing and closing public comment; the Planning Commission adopted a Motion of Intent to Disapprove; and Continued the matter to October 1, 2015 by a vote of +7 -0.

SPEAKERS: None
ACTION: Disapproved
AYES: Fong, Antonini, Hillis, Johnson, Moore, Richards
ABSENT: Wu
MOTION: 19484

3. [2015-007505CUA](#) (O. MASRY: (415) 575-9116)
 678 PORTOLA DRIVE - along Portola Drive, east of Sydney Way; Lot 004 in Assessor's Block 2892 - Request for **Conditional Use Authorization**, pursuant to Planning Code Sections 209.1 and 303 to modify an existing Verizon Wireless macro Wireless Telecommunications Services (WTS) Facility, and allow a total of up to six (6) screened panel antennas. The property is within a Residential-House, One-Family Detached Zoning District (RH-1)(D), Scenic Street Special Sign District, and a 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

SPEAKERS: None
 ACTION: Approved with Conditions
 AYES: Fong, Antonini, Hillis, Johnson, Moore, Richards
 ABSENT: Wu
 MOTION: 19485

C. COMMISSION MATTERS

4. Consideration of Adoption:
- [Draft Minutes for Joint Hearing of September 17, 2015](#)
 - [Draft Minutes for September 17, 2015](#)

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

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 Hillis:

So last week, we talked a little bit about the article in SF Magazine, Commissioner Moore and both Director Rahaim, brought it up. I hadn't had a chance to read it, and was able to read since the Commission hearing last week. I think there were some interesting points and some valid issues, that were brought up in the article, but I did want to take issue with some of the quotes that Commissioner Moore brought up about the Planning staff and this Commission, and I think they were unfortunate, I disagree with those comments. Especially the comments around staff, and I come to this Commission from a unique perspective, I worked with the City for over 15 years before sitting on this Commission, for now, three years and have had the pleasure of working with Planning staff throughout that time period. I just want to commend them on the work they do. I think it is quite a feat what the staff does every day and every week, here at the Commission. And, if I look back on the last three years that I've been on the Commission, the issues we've tackled,

which I think, we've not done all, but at the urging and the leadership of the staff, in-law units, major neighborhood planning efforts, Central SOMA and the Mission, increased density, our Waterfront, Short Term Rentas, the urban forest, parking and transit policies and fees, formula retail, and affordability and diversity. I mean, these are huge issues, you know, have had constituents on both side, they're usually are not winners or losers, we come out, and make the best policy we can, but these are controversial projects that I think staff has weighed into and done a noble job on, and I know from sitting on the city side of things they don't often get the credit, I mean when there's the quote unquote the ribbon cutting or legislation that is being signed, it's not the staff doing it necessarily, but I think they deserve to be there and I appreciate their efforts and that's not to say there are not still big issues in the City. Certainly we hear it every week about affordability, displacement and gentrification, but I think, solutions to them, are going to come the same way solutions came to those issues, not through some soundbites necessarily, but through important policy changes and debate, and we've talked about them: small site acquisitions, Ellis reform, increasing revenue for affordability, increasing inclusionary percentages, increase density where appropriate, even rent control reform. I think we look to staff to kind of help guide us and I think the Board looks to you and I think the Mayor looks to do the same. I appreciate all your work and I think we're the envy of most Planning Departments in the City and that is all due to staff.

Commissioner Richards:

A couple of things in today's paper, there an article about of the future of driving, if anybody has a chance to read it, it is in the Chronicle, page 1, it is really interesting, and parlaying on that in terms of some projects we have come before us we are looking at projects that are being designed for the way we drive today, but they are not being designed for the way driving is going to be done tomorrow. I really want to make sure that lens is also being looked at. One of the projects we have, I forward to Director Ionin had additional requests for parking, again, in today's world that may or may not make sense. I did get from the GIS team, and I really appreciate the effort that they did, information around the census track, how many people drive to work, etc., when we have those really rare cases when they're asking for more parking, perhaps that kind of data can be included in the packet. I did ask that it be forwarded to the Commission, maybe that will be an information you'll take today, on the one project that we have for that CU. Really interesting article about where we are going in terms of cars, and driverless cars and the need to not have a car anymore. Thanks.

Commissioner Antonini:

In regards to the article in the San Francisco Magazine, I happened to read it just this morning, I think, it brings up a lot of interesting challenges for the City and the Commission and the staff, as was mentioned in the various comments from all the commenters not just Commissioner Moore. But, I would take exception in my own case, that I do not – I am completely independent, no one tells me how to vote, I make up my own mind on issues, I always have, I really don't care what--which way public opinion way opinion is. I feel I vote, on whether I think something is beneficial for the City.

Commissioner Johnson:

Thanks very much, I'm not going to pile on to the San Francisco Magazine, only to say, along with Commissioner Hillis I really didn't get to read article until half way through the Commission hearing and just want to say, I think, that we definitely look at more than architecture here. We do a lot of policy planning and a lot of forward thinking about the city, and I think we are very good Commissioners and I'll get to the staff in one second. Commissioners are all very professionally

capable and work really hard on this Commission. I think we all bring something relevant to what we do. In terms of the staff, you guys are like one of the hardest working Planning Departments I have ever seen, I have only been on the Planning Commission for – getting up, past one year, a year plus now, but I have seen that around the country what I have observed is not as thoughtful and hardworking as you guys, certainly other cities don't have the same issues that you grapple with, that is part of it as well, you guys do a fantastic job, I try to call you out whenever I can, I hope that other Commissioners will be doing the same. I just wanted to say a couple of more things. Commissioner Richards brings up an interesting point because just to add on to what you are saying, how we're thinking about our infrastructure for cars today, may not match what we're going to see in the very near future. The CEO Uber himself, was asked in an article about city planning, what do you think is going to be the biggest change that Uber and shared ride companies, as well as, eventually the self-driving car technology is going to bring to cities? What do you hope to be your impact on the City? And he was like, I hope there's no such thing as a parking lot anymore, in a building, that's was he said, I hope my impact on physical infrastructure of cities, is that there will be no more parking lots. So, certainly I think that we need to be more forward thinking about that, and I think as we look at some of the projects we have today, like 1198 Valencia Street and others, that are looking at increased parking, maybe today, that it is something that people who are moving into a building may say, in less than a generation, the ratio will not be, so the very minimum we need to be thinking in the back of our heads, what are we thinking about in terms of adaptive reuse, knowing that maybe that is what we need for infrastructure for the next decade...something, after that it won't be necessary. We're going to have all these empty spaces on the ground floor and below ground to think about. Last quick thing, read an article in the New York Times, on Sunday, I can't pull it up right now, so I hope I don't butcher this now, but the New York City Council passed legislation to protect tenants against landowners who used, sort of necessary construction as a way to intimidate rent-controlled tenants from moving out, so we talk about owner move-ins but, in New York City they're talking about the Building Department, really beginning to enforce further on landlords, who do things, like saying, I am going to rehab the common area, and then do construction on the whole building, and make the floor shake in the middle of the night, so that rent-controlled tenants will move out of their apartments. And not to say, that that is something we need to focus on here, but certainly just putting a highlight that there are other places in the country, where legislators, in this case the new York City Council are beginning to think about those issues as a key part of maintaining affordable housing in the city and maintaining culture and diversity in their neighborhoods, so, I think, last week we were talking about owner move-ins and other ways of preventing evictions in the first place, so that we don't necessarily have to come in the back end, and as a safety net, and that sort of struck me as here is a city that is actually taking some steps toward on doing that. I thought that it was really interesting.

Commissioner Fong:

If can add on to the – I really started to track the self-driving cars movement for the last year and half, and it is phenomenal, Commissioner Johnson, not to bring up a dialogue, but it really comes back to land, and land use, and what happens to garages, what happens to hotel parking lots, etc. It would be interesting to have a little bit of a forum discussion with those who are in the leadership position with cars and traffic to see where we can forecast ourselves in the next five to 15 years. Picking up a little bit on the San Francisco Magazine article, I want to be respectful to any of us who have an opportunity, a right to share our own opinions, and I think, that is important in these kind of leadership roles, so I think it is important, sort of basic, not to call out a Department or staff, especially publicly. We have the privilege, really, of representing the City. Representing all aspects of the City, but also an opportunity, if we have an issue to take it up

with the Director, with staff, so hopefully in the future those things can be done, sort of, privately and not calling people out. I want to appreciate staff and thank them; this is a tough decade we're in, in San Francisco. Some may call it the best of times and some may call it the worst of times. That is certainly not our intention. I hope that these kind of comments are brought to light, but also bring everyone together to work together, to fix the problems rather than be divisive and separate them.

Commissioner Moore:

I do want to acknowledge Commissioner Hillis for concisely summarizing the strength of the Department and the pieces of work, which stand clearly as exceptional, not only in the City, but also in the Country. I am one of the people who have the fortune to speak about the strengths of what the City does in terms of planning and urban design, both nationally and internationally and my praise does not fall short to acknowledge the work, which I have basically been participating in for the next -- for the last ten years. And it is my intent to continue to support and further urban design and planning in this Department -- as a colleague, do it as a supporter and do it as a critic in the form that is appropriate to the role I hold as a Planning Commissioner. As I said before, my comments in a discussion about public interest values have been taken out of context from a long conversation about a subject matter that is looking back of what is the essence of the Urban Design Plan created in the 70s and early 80s. It was a look back, in order to set a frame of conversation about architecture, which at this moment is very difficult to frame in the exact set of terms than it was then. It was more than that, there was no intent to hurt or slander anybody. And I repeat my comments from last week to the Department, and the Director and everybody else, has my support as does this Commission, who works with a lot of energy and a lot of diligence to tackle issues that are difficult indeed.

Commissioner Richards:

One thing I forgot to mention, coupling on President Fong's comments on the best decade and worst decade, if you haven't had a chance to watch the HBO documentary San Francisco 2.0, please watch it, it is a very sobering look at San Francisco today and what we're faced with, in terms of balancing the growth and with also keeping the City, the soul of the City. I recommend it. It is on HBO to go as well on Showtime, if you have it. Thank you.

D. DEPARTMENT MATTERS

6. [Director's Announcements](#)

Director Rahaim:

Good afternoon, Commissioners, just one announcement regarding a piece that is noted in your written Director's Report about the Bayshore Multi-Model Study, this is a study, that we are involved with, with the MTA and the Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure (OCII), and with -- it is multi -- it's a bi-county study, if you will with San Mateo County, it is looking at the node -- if you will, around Visitacion Valley and the Caltrain Station and the end of the MUNI line, to look to see if there are options for rearranging some of the transportation and transit service in that area, including potential relocation of the Caltrans Station, potential extension or not of the MUNI line to serve Visitacion Valley, the Schlage site and the northern part of Brisbane there, so it is that kind of knuckle, if you will, in the southeast corner of the City, at Brisbane. There is -- for your and the public benefit, there is an open house on Tuesday, the 6th from 6 to 8 PM, at the Visitacion Valley library, which is at 201 Leland Avenue.

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

LAND USE COMMITTEE:

- **150790 Planning Code - Establishing a New Citywide Transportation Sustainability Fee.** Sponsor: Mayor; Wiener, Breed and Christensen. Staff: Chen. Planning Commission heard this item on September 10th of this year and voted to recommend approval with 6 modifications. At the land use hearing, the Committee heard presentations by Staff and Director Rahaim, and a significant amount of public comment. The Committee members also debated the Planning Commissions proposed recommendations, in particular the elimination of the area plan fee credit, the feasibility of raising the fee amount to 33%, and requiring the fee to hospitals that require a full Institutional Master Plan. After the discussion there was a consensus on the committee that these issues needed more research, so the committee continued the item one more week to October 5.

FULL BOARD OF SUPERVISORS:

- **150586 Planning Code, Zoning Map - Rezoning a Portion of Daggett Street to Public Use/Open Space Zoning.** Sponsor: Cohen. Staff: Wertheim. Passed its Second read.
- **150496 Planning Code - Inclusionary Housing Requirements in the Eastern Neighborhoods.** Sponsor: Kim. Staff: Starr. Passed its First Read.
- **150712 Public Hearing - Appeal of Final Negative Declaration - Recology Landfill Disposal Agreement - Hay Road Landfill in Solano County.** Staff: Maltzer, Jones. On Tuesday, the Board of Supervisors heard an appeal on the Negative Declaration issued for the Landfill Disposal Agreement at the Hay Road Landfill in Solano County. The project is an agreement between the City and Recology for disposal of municipal solid waste at the Hay Road Landfill. The agreement would result in the truck trips now destined for the Altamont Landfill in Alameda County to instead go to the Hay Road Landfill in Solano County. The Neg Dec analyzed the physical environmental impacts of the new truck route, which is 20 miles longer than the existing route.

The appeal was brought by an organization called the Solano County Orderly Growth Committee. Several members of the public spoke on both sides of the appeal. Board members questioned Planning staff and Department of the Environment staff on the reasoning behind the choice of the Hay Road landfill and the volume of waste generated by San Francisco. Some supervisors expressed the view that any concerns from Solano County residents about the Hay Road landfill would have been vetted in Solano County when the landfill was approved in 2012. At the end of the hearing, the Board voted 11-0 to uphold the Planning Commission's approval of the Negative Declaration, on a motion by Supervisor Wiener and a second by Supervisor Campos.

INTRODUCTIONS

- **150972 Interim Prohibition Extension on Commercial Mergers in the Proposed Calle 24 Special Use District.** Sponsor: Campos. Staff: D. Sanchez. Urgency Ordinance approving an extension of the interim prohibition on commercial storefront mergers of greater than 799 gross square feet in the proposed Calle 24 Special Use District.
- **150969 Planning Code - Affordable Housing Bonus Programs.** Sponsor: Mayor, Tang. Staff: Dischinger, Mohan. Ordinance amending the Planning Code to create the Affordable Housing Bonus Programs, consisting of the Local Affordable Housing Bonus Program, the 100 Percent Affordable Housing Bonus Program, the Analyzed State Density Bonus

Program, and the Individually Requested State Density Bonus Program, to provide for development bonuses and zoning modifications for affordable housing, in compliance with, and above those required by the State Density Bonus Law, Government Code, Section 65915, et seq.; to establish the procedures in which the Local Affordable Housing Bonus Program and the 100 Percent Affordable Housing Bonus Program shall be reviewed and approved; amending the Planning Code to exempt projects from the height limits specified in the Planning Code and the Zoning Maps.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

Planning Commission Recommended Amendments to the TSF

1. Grandfather residential projects before July 1, 2014 with a 50% fee reduction and residential projects after July 1, 2014 with a 25% fee reduction;
2. Exempt non-profit secondary institutions that require a full Institutional Master Plan from paying the fee;
3. Apply the fee to non-profit hospitals that require a full Institutional Master Plan;
4. Request that the Board consider fee rates of up to 33% of nexus, subject to further analysis of development feasibility;
5. Request that the Board consider graduated fee rates based on area/neighborhood of the city, and/or consider removing the area plan fee reduction; and,
6. Require economic feasibility analysis updates every three years rather than five, and include the Planning Commission as an entity that may request analyses sooner.

BOARD OF APPEALS:

No Report

HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION:

No Report

8. (T. OJEDA: (415) 558-6251)
[HOUSING BALANCE REPORT](#) - On April 21, 2015, the Board of Supervisors passed Ordinance No. 53-15 amending the Planning Code to include a new Section 103 requiring the Planning Department to monitor and report on the "housing balance" between new market rate housing and new affordable housing production. The ordinance required the first report be submitted by June 1, 2015 and subsequent reports are to be submitted September 1 and March 1 of each year. The ordinance also mandated an annual public hearing before the Board of Supervisors on the progress towards meeting the City's affordable housing goals. The annual hearings are to be held by April 1. This informational hearing will introduce the initial reports and its findings to the Commission.
 Preliminary Recommendation: No Action Required - Informational Only

SPEAKERS: = George Schuttish – Questions raised about the report
 + Peter Cohen – Impressive staff work, reason behind measuring the data
 + Donald Dusseff – Housing obstructionist impact on housing supply

ACTION: None – Informational

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: Bruce Bowen – Lot mergers, loss of potential housing
 Zalya Kelly – Bayview/Hunter’s Point – public open space
 Mie Yaginuma – Public open space for the Bayview youth
 Peter Cohen – Jim Meko, five foot bump
 Sue Hestor – Residential sales prices
 George Schuttish – District 8 has the highest number of evictions
 Mary Eliza – Lack of enforcement

F. 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.

9. [2015-003049CUA](#) (C. CLARKE: (415) 575-9184)
2406 BRYANT STREET - southwest corner of Bryant and 22nd Streets, Lot 039 in Assessor’s Block 4150 - Request for **Conditional Use Authorization** pursuant to Planning Code Sections [186](#), [710.44](#), [790.91](#), and [790.142](#), for a change of use from a Limited Restaurant to a Restaurant (d.b.a. El Metate Con Sabor A Mexico) within an RH-3 (Residential House, Three Units) Zoning District and 40-X Height and Bulk District. This project has been reviewed under the Community Business Priority Processing Program (CB3P) that was adopted by the Planning Commission on February 12, 2015 under Resolution Number 19323. 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 September 17, 2015)

SPEAKERS: + Francisco Hernandez – Project presentation
 + (M) Speaker – Restaurant history
 + Cilia Monhemana – Community benefits and support
 + Asha Safai – Wonderful restaurant
 + William Ortiz Catahena – Support
 + Marie Sorenson – Great business, good healthy food

ACTION: Approved with Conditions
 AYES: Fong, Antonini, Hillis, Johnson, Moore, Richards
 ABSENT: Wu
 MOTION: 19486

10. [2015-011449PCA](#) (A. STARR: (415) 558-6362)
PLANNING CODE AMENDMENT - RE-DEFINE FORMULA RETAIL TO INCLUDE SUBSIDIARIES -
Planning Code Amendment to revise the definition of formula retail to include subsidiaries or affiliates of formula retail meeting certain criteria; affirming the Planning Department’s determination under the California Environmental Quality Act; making Planning Code,

Section 302, findings; and making findings of consistency with the General Plan, and the eight priority policies of Planning Code, Section 101.1.

Preliminary Recommendation: TBD

SPEAKERS: None
 ACTION: Continued to November 19, 2015
 AYES: Fong, Antonini, Hillis, Johnson, Moore, Richards
 ABSENT: Wu

11. [2008.0586E](#) (T. CHANG: (415) 575-9197)
ACADEMY OF ART UNIVERSITY – **Informational Presentation** to the Planning Commission regarding the status of the environmental review, Institutional Master Plan, policy issues, and processing strategies for the Academy of Art University (AAU).

SPEAKERS: Georgia Schuttish – Great staff report, AAU should not be forgiven
 Mary Eliza – Major infraction should not be ignored
 Sue Hestor – AAU operating illegally. Suggested procedures ____ forward
 Alan Murphy – AAU counsel comments
 Marie Sorenson – Examine the nuts and bolts of the AAU operation
 Jake McGoldrick – Use the hammer, it's time
 ACTION: None - Informational

12. [2012.0865C](#) (D. VU: (415) 575-9120)
1198 VALENCIA STREET - northwest corner of Valencia and 23rd Streets; Lot 014 in Assessor's Block 3635 - Request for **Conditional Use Authorization** pursuant to Planning Code Sections 121.1, 151.1, 202.5 and 303, to demolish an automobile service station and construct an approximately 60,400 gross square foot, five-story 55-foot tall building consisting of up to 49 dwelling units, approximately 5,100 square feet of commercial space, and up to 37 off-street parking spaces in a basement level garage in the Valencia Street Neighborhood Commercial Transit (NCT) District and 55-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

SPEAKERS: + David Silverman – Project introduction
 + Nick Krammer – Project presentation
 + (M) Speaker – Design presentation
 - Jacke Barshack – Potential environmental impacts
 - Sharon York – Design, height, congestion
 - Lindsay Chambers – Anything but condo, shadow
 - Laura Ash – Shadow, height, architecture
 - Dietrick Ripelski – Poem
 - Marie Sorenson – Too tall, pay to plan
 - Shannon Boltz – No notification, vehemently opposed, luxury condos
 + Peter Cory – Design recommendations
 = Mary Fitzgerald – Design and street character
 + Tim Collen - Complies with EN plan
 = Donald Dusseff – Compliant project
 ACTION: Approved with Conditions as amended to include:

1. Five separate retail spaces;
2. 0.6+ parking ratio, for 30 independently accessible off-street parking spaces (five for BMR);
3. Two car share spaces; and
4. Two additional three bedroom units, for a total of four.

AYES: Fong, Antonini, Hillis, Johnson, Moore, Richards

ABSENT: Wu

MOTION: 19487

2:30 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.

13. (W. WIETGREFE: (415) 575-9050)

[SHOWPLACE SQUARE/POTRERO HILL AND CENTRAL WATERFRONT](#) – **Informational Presentation** regarding growth within the Eastern Neighborhoods, including the growth projections from the Eastern Neighborhoods Environmental Impact Report; the priorities identified within the Eastern Neighborhoods Plan regarding transportation and open space improvements and the status of those improvements in relation to that growth; and the upcoming Eastern Neighborhoods Monitoring Report. The presentation will focus on the Showplace Square/Potrero Hill and Central Waterfront neighborhoods.

Preliminary Recommendation: None – Informational

SPEAKERS: - (F) Speaker – Potrero Hill resident concerns, are ___ project options
 - Tony Kelly – Design issues, 2016 projects
 - Jay Edward – Transit planning
 - Richard Pretzel – Parking
 - Yaro Merose – Traffic

ACTION: None – Informational

14. [2011.1300E](#) (C. THOMAS: (415) 575-9036)

[901 16TH/1200 17TH STREET](#) - 3.5-acre site west side of Mississippi Street between 16th Street and 17th Street in northern Potrero Hill; Lots 001,001A and 002 in Assessor's Block 3949 and Lot 001 in Assessor's Block 3950 - **Public Hearing on the Draft Environmental Impact Report**. The project site currently contains two metal shed industrial warehouse buildings, a brick office building determined to be an eligible historic resource, a modular office structure, and surface parking lots. The proposed project would merge the four lots into two lots, demolish the two warehouses and the modular office structure, and preserve the brick office building. The project sponsor proposes to construct two new buildings on-site. The "16th Street Building" at 901 16th Street would consist of a new six-story, 68-foot tall (excluding rooftop projections of up to 82 feet), approximately 402,943 gross square foot (gsf) residential mixed-use building with 260 dwelling units and 20,318 gsf of retail on the northern lot. The "17th Street Building" at 1200 17th Street would consist of a new four-story 48-foot tall (excluding rooftop projections of up to 52 feet), approximately 213,509 gsf residential mixed-use building with 135 dwelling units and 4,650 gsf of retail on the southern lot. In addition, the proposed project would construct a new publicly accessible pedestrian alley along the entirety of its western property line. Combined, the

two new buildings would contain a total of 395 dwelling units and 24,968 gsf of retail space, in addition to a total of 388 vehicular parking spaces and 455 off-street bicycle parking spaces. The proposed project would include 14,669 square feet of public open space, 33,149 square feet of common open space shared by project occupants, and 3,114 square feet of open space private to units. The project site is within the UMU (Urban Mixed Use) Use District and 48-X (southern portion) and 68-X (northern portion) Height and Bulk Districts. The proposed project would require a Large Project Authorization with various exceptions, a Conditional Use Approval for retail use size exceeding 3,999 square feet, and a General Plan Referral for sidewalk changes.

Note: Written comments will be accepted at the Planning Department until 5:00 p.m. on October 5, 2015.

Preliminary Recommendation: Review and Comment

(Continued from Regular Meeting of September 17, 2015)

SPEAKERS:

- + Jim Tasket – Human presence
- = Catherine Pettrin – Historic integrity
- = Joe Buttler – Presentation alternative
- + Corrine Woods – Reduced project alternative, traffic and transportation
- + Kathy Corneleo –
- + Edward Hattert – Responsive
- + Peter Linenthal – Metal shed re-use alternative
- + Yaro Merose – Cumulative impacts; open space
- + Lester Zeigman – Support
- Irving Gunney – Warriors Arena
- Rob Myer – Metal shed re-use alternative
- Allison Heath – EIR misrepresents development projections
- Richard Dwyer – Traffic
- Andra – Traffic conditions, metal shed re-use alternative
- David Boyd – Metal shed alternative
- (M) Speaker – Unavoidable substantial impacts
- Vincent Agor – Metal shed alternative, traffic data limitations
- Philip Anasovich – Density limits
- (F) Speaker – traffic data
- Janet Carpinelli – Support
- (M) Speaker -

ACTION: Reviewed and Commented

AYES: Fong, Antonini, Hillis, Johnson, Moore, Richards

ABSENT: Wu

G. 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 – 7:49 P.M.