From:	Secretary, Commissions (CPC)
To:	Wertheim, Steve (CPC)
Cc:	Gerber, Patricia (CPC)
Subject:	FW: YIMBY Action Opposition to the Central SoMa Plan
Date:	Friday, September 01, 2017 8:56:45 AM
Attachments:	Central SoMa Opposition.pdf

Office of Commission Affairs

Planning Department | City & County of San Francisco
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, CA 94103
Direct: 415-558-6309 | Fax: 415-558-6409

commissions.secretary@sfgov.org
www.sfplanning.org

From: Laura Clark [mailto:laura@yimbyaction.org]
Sent: Thursday, August 31, 2017 11:58 AM
To: richhillissf@gmail.com; Richards, Dennis (CPC); planning@rodneyfong.com; Johnson, Christine (CPC); Koppel, Joel (CPC); Melgar, Myrna (CPC); Moore, Kathrin (CPC); Secretary, Commissions (CPC)
Subject: YIMBY Action Opposition to the Central SoMa Plan

Dear Commissioners,

Please find our letter of opposition to the Central SoMa Plan attached.

Also worth noting is YIMBY activist Scott Feeney's oped in the Bay City Beacon, which can be found here:

> https://www.thebaycitybeacon.com/politics/op-ed-the-central-soma-plan-will-worsen-displacement-crisis/article_60c16a3a-8dfe-11e7-b167-5bc05a6d448c.html

Thank you for your time,
Laura

Laura Foote Clark
Executive Director | Pronouns: she/her

c. (415) 489-0197
e. laura@yimbyaction.org

Check out our podcast INFILL

Keep the pro-housing movement going - Become a member!

From:	Secretary, Commissions (CPC)
To:	Gordon-Jonckheer, Elizabeth (CPC)
Cc:	Gerber, Patricia (CPC)
Subject:	FW: Discretionary Review Hearing for 653 28th Street - Permit Application No. 201702179712
Date:	Friday, September 01, 2017 8:55:51 AM

Office of Commission Affairs

Planning Department | City & County of San Francisco
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, CA 94103
Direct: 415-558-6309 | Fax: 415-558-6409

commissions.secretary@sfgov.org
www.sfplanning.org

From: foggy-hills@tutanota.com [mailto:foggy-hills@tutanota.com]
Sent: Thursday, August 31, 2017 7:39 PM
To: Secretary, Commissions (CPC); Richards, Dennis (CPC); Planning; Johnson, Christine (CPC); Koppel, Joel (CPC); Melgar, Myrna (CPC); Moore, Kathrin (CPC); Richhillissf
Subject: Discretionary Review Hearing for 653 28th Street - Permit Application No. 201702179712

President Hillis, Vice President Richards, and Members of the Planning Commission,

I am writing you to express my concerns regarding the revised proposed project at 653 28th Street. As you might recall, the initial proposed plan was reviewed by the planning commissioners during the DR hearing on June 8th; the direction to the architect was to work with the neighbors, reduce deck sizes and numbers, respect the stepping roofline and topography of the street by reducing height and switching the 2nd and 3rd floors, and reduce total size of the building

The plan updates are:

-
- *The decks on the roof, third floor, and second floor are kept*
- *Horizontal buildout in the backyard increased*
-
- *top floor from 9.10 FT to 12 FT*
- *Second floor from 9.10 FT to 12 FT*
-
- *Horizontal build out in the front increased from 2 FT to 5 FT*
- *Total building reduced 159 Sq Ft (one powder room removed; everything else kept)*
- *The building height reduced from 32.10 FT to 29.5 FT*

My concerns are:

-
- The proposed plan cast a huge shadow on the adjacent house despite it being down the hill!, and box-in the neighboring properties to the East and West

- Total loss of sun light from the center (light-well) and north side, as well as over 4 hours of morning light from the south side
- Encroaches on the mid-block open space at a time when urban green space is encouraged to be preserved rather than reduced
- The three large decks (roof, third floor, and second floor) will disturb peace and privacy of the neighbors
- This is a trophy house disguised as single family house with additional unit; it will demand a price that would be out of the reach of middle class families and the additional unit will not be rented by a person with means to purchase such an expensive house

Given the number of issues with this project, I urge you to consider neighbourhood concerns and impose limitations on this project in its current form.

Thank you for giving your time and attention to this matter.
I'd be happy to answer any additional questions you may have.

Sincerely,
Hana Eftekhari

From:	Secretary, Commissions (CPC)
To:	Gordon-Jonckheer, Elizabeth (CPC)
Cc:	Gerber, Patricia (CPC)
Subject:	FW: 653 28th Street - Permit Application No. 201702179712- neighborhood concerns
Date:	Friday, September 01, 2017 8:55:50 AM
Attachments:	653 28th Street DR-Sept 7.pptx

Office of Commission Affairs

Planning Department | City & County of San Francisco
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, CA 94103
Direct: 415-558-6309 | Fax: 415-558-6409

commissions.secretary@sfgov.org
www.sfplanning.org

From: foggy-hills@tutanota.com [mailto:foggy-hills@tutanota.com]
Sent: Thursday, August 31, 2017 8:47 PM
To: Richhillissf; Richards, Dennis (CPC); Planning; Johnson, Christine (CPC); Koppel, Joel (CPC); Melgar, Myrna (CPC); Moore, Kathrin (CPC); Secretary, Commissions (CPC); Dctfree; Asael; Jchunod; Jp
Subject: 653 28th Street - Permit Application No. 201702179712- neighborhood concerns

President Hillis, Vice President Richards, and Members of the Planning Commission,
Given the number of issues with the project 653 28th Street, I urge you to consider neighbourhood concerns and don't approve the proposed building in it's current form.

-
- The proposed plan is not following planning commission direction to reduce number and size of the decks, switch second and third floor to reduce horizontal build out, and respect the stepping roofline and topography of the street ; to the contrary it has extended horizontal build out, kept all three decks, and the entire roofline is not stepping down
- It does not promote proportionality between buildings
- It does not respect adjacent properties day light
- It does not respect existing mid-block open space
- It does not preserve relatively affordable housing
- Entire *1,339 SQ FT* of kitchen/living room or *5 master bedrooms* with each having a private bathroom, three large decks are not required to increase density and housing stock
- This is a trophy house disguised as single family house with additional unit; it will demand a price that would be out of the reach of middle class families and the additional unit will not be rented by a person with means to purchase such an expensive house
- No new 311 was sent to the neighbors despite backyard build out increased from 9.10 FT to 12 FT in the new proposal; many neighbors are unaware and not enough time to inform them due to the labor day holiday as this increase was discovered on August 30th by reading the email communication between the builder and planning

department

Thank you for giving your time and attention to this matter.
I’d be happy to answer any additional questions you may have.

Hana Eftekhari

From:	Secretary, Commissions (CPC)
To:	Gordon-Jonckheer, Elizabeth (CPC)
Cc:	Gerber, Patricia (CPC)
Subject:	FW: Discretionary Review Hearing for 653 28th Street - Permit Application No. 201702179712
Date:	Friday, September 01, 2017 8:55:31 AM

Office of Commission Affairs

Planning Department | City & County of San Francisco
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, CA 94103
Direct: 415-558-6309 | Fax: 415-558-6409

commissions.secretary@sfgov.org
www.sfplanning.org

From: Asael Dror [mailto:asael@dror.org]
Sent: Thursday, August 31, 2017 9:15 PM
To: Secretary, Commissions (CPC); Richards, Dennis (CPC); planning@rodneyfong.com; Johnson, Christine (CPC); Koppel, Joel (CPC); Melgar, Myrna (CPC); Moore, Kathrin (CPC); richhillissf@yahoo.com
Subject: Discretionary Review Hearing for 653 28th Street - Permit Application No. 201702179712

Dear Planning Commission,

As the owner and resident of 643 28th Street, 2 houses down from the proposed project, I was shocked to find out that on September 7th you will be reviewing changes to this project for which no notification about them was given to me.

From the little I have seen of this "modified" project, the proposed project is extremely out of any consistency with the neighborhood, and drastically cuts into the green space in the back.

Consequently, I urge you to reject this permit, or at least delay any action on this project until the adjacent property owners are given sufficient information and time to review and respond.

Sincerely,

Asael Dror
643 28th Street

From:	Secretary, Commissions (CPC)
To:	Johnson, Christine (CPC); Richards, Dennis (CPC); Koppel, Joel (CPC); Moore, Kathrin (CPC); Melgar, Myrna (CPC); richhillissf@yahoo.com; Rodney Fong
Cc:	Gerber, Patricia (CPC); Foster, Nicholas (CPC)
Subject:	FW: 8/31/17 Planning Commission - No. 12 -- 2017-002430CUA -- 948-950 Lombard & 841 Chestnut
Date:	Thursday, August 31, 2017 11:33:25 AM
Attachments:	948-950 Lombard-841 Chestnut.pdf
Importance:	High

Office of Commission Affairs

Planning Department | City & County of San Francisco
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, CA 94103
Direct: 415-558-6309 | Fax: 415-558-6409

commissions.secretary@sfgov.org
www.sfplanning.org

From: Kathleen Courtney [mailto:kcourtney@rhcasf.com]
Sent: Wednesday, August 30, 2017 10:58 PM
To: Commissioner Rich Hillis
Cc: Secretary, Commissions (CPC); Foster, Nicholas (CPC); Farrell, Mark (BOS); design@rhnsf.org; Robyn Tucker ; Jamie Cherry RHCA
Subject: 8/31/17 Planning Commission - No. 12 -- 2017-002430CUA -- 948-950 Lombard & 841 Chestnut
Importance: High

Commissioner Hillis, attached and pasted below is the Russian Hill Community Association request that the Conditional Use for this project be denied. We request that Commission Secretary Ionin distribute this letter to the Commissioners and Planner Foster note in his remarks to the Commission that this letter and other communications objecting to the CU request have been received.

Russian Hill Community Association

1166 Green St. San Francisco, CA 94109 510-928-8243 rhcasf.com

August 30, 2017

President Rich Hillis and
Members of the San Francisco Planning Commission
1650 Mission Street Room 400
San Francisco, CA 94103-2479

Re: 8/31/17 Planning Commission Agenda No. 12
Case No. 2017-002430CUA 948-950 Lombard Street & 841 Chestnut Street

Dear President Hillis and Members of the Planning Commission:

You need to read between the lines of the Executive Summary for the Conditional Use request

for a lot merger for the above project to realize that **there has been a massive failure of the Planning process resulting in the loss of a historic resource and potential significant negative impacts on the surrounding neighborhood.**

While the history of the project is less than clearly outlined, either deliberately or inadvertently, it is worth noting that the Executive Summary Project History identifies **12 separate applications/permits**. And more are listed on the Department of Building Inspection's database. Also significant are the **litany of errors, omissions, oversights and lack of coordination between Planning and the Department of Building Inspection noted in the Project History:**

- "Building Permit Application No. 2011.11.04.8277 was filed and approved on November 4, 2011, to correct the record and validate the approved permit at both legal properties."[Project History Par. 2]
- "Planning Department Staff approved the merger of the subject lots (Lots 10 and 17) on April 22, 2015 based upon incomplete information contained within the Department of Building Inspection (DBI) Report of Residential Building Record ("3-R Report). [Project History Par.5]
- "On April 2, 2016, a complaint was filed on the property regarding work beyond the scope of permit…On June 9, 2016, building Permit Application No. 2016.06.09.9584 was issued with an engineer's notice and no plans…No changes to approved design proposed." [Project History Par. 6]
- "On June 15, 2016, building Permit Application No. 2016.06.15.9992 was submitted with one sheet of plans illustrating the full removal of all historic material…The plans were approved by DBI without Planning Department review or approval." [Project History Par.6]
- "At the time all plans were submitted, the property had been effectively demolished; all permits were filed to correct the record." [Project History Par. 6]
- "On July 6, 2016, a complaint was filed with the Planning Department … citing the possible demolition of a historic resource without Planning Department approval…Planning Department Staff conducted a site visit on November 8, 2016, where it was determined that the building was composed of all new framing and sheathing." [Project History. Par 7]

The Russian Hill Community Association respectfully requests that the Planning Commission consider all of the facts and circumstances of this situation and deny the request for a lot merger.

Unfortunately, the stipulation in the settlement agreement requiring that all future permits be reviewed by the Planning Department and that the Project Sponsor not exceed the scope of work on approved permits does not provide the assurance that it should.

Violators of the Planning and Building Codes should not be rewarded. The requested merger of the two lots should be denied. Alternatives for access to the properties need to be explored. This is a precedent setting case and should not be addressed to simply clear the calendar. Please deny the Conditional Use request to merge two lots.

Sincerely,
Kathleen Courtney
Chair, Housing & Zoning Committee

Cc: Jamie Cherry, Jeff Cheney, RHCA; Robyn Tucker, PANA; Bob Bluhm, RHN; District 2 Supervisor Mark Farrell

From:	Ionin, Jonas (CPC)
To:	Tran, Nancy (CPC)
Cc:	Gerber, Patricia (CPC)
Subject:	FW: Submission for 437 Hoffman Avenue. 2015-003686 DRP, hearing on September 14, 2017
Date:	Thursday, August 31, 2017 11:30:43 AM
Attachments:	2017-08-24 DR for 437 Hoffman, supplemental submission of petitioner Beffel (00609160xB2B8F).pdf

Jonas P. Ionin,
Director of Commission Affairs

Planning Department | City & County of San Francisco
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, CA 94103
Direct: 415-558-6309 | Fax: 415-558-6409

jonas.ionin@sfgov.org
www.sfplanning.org

From: Ernie Beffel [mailto:ebeffel@hmbay.com]
Sent: Thursday, August 24, 2017 1:51 PM
To: Secretary, Commissions (CPC); Ionin, Jonas (CPC)
Cc: richhillissf@yahoo.com; Richards, Dennis (CPC); planning@rodneyfong.com; Johnson, Christine (CPC); Koppel, Joel (CPC); Melgar, Myrna (CPC); Moore, Kathrin (CPC); kellymcondon@gmail.com; Chris Wine (chris.wine@teradata.com); Janet Fowler; Tran, Nancy (CPC); Washington, Delvin (CPC)
Subject: Submission for 437 Hoffman Avenue. 2015-003686 DRP, hearing on September 14, 2017

Dear Commissions Secretary:

Attached please find my supplemental submission to be included with supporting papers for the PC hearing in a few weeks. Please acknowledge receipt.

We reserve the right to file additional supplemental papers, if the project sponsor submits revised plans to Planning. To the best of my knowledge, the continuance requested by the developer has not resulted in submission to Planning of revised plans.

Our suggestion, made in prior submissions, remains for the project sponsor to scale back this project in line with 55 Homestead Street, an ongoing project similarly situated and within 200 feet of this site. While 3500 square feet is more than fifty percent larger than the average residence on Block 6503, it would be much more reasonable than 5350 square feet. Similarly, 35 feet over grade would be more reasonable than 53 feet over grade.

If you need an additional copy of my prior submission to include in the September meeting materials, please advise and I will send another copy.

Thank you.

Best regards,

Ernie Beffel

Haynes Beffel & Wolfeld LLP | PO Box 366, 637 Main St | Half Moon Bay, CA 94019
ebeffel@hmbay.com | 650-712-0340 phone | 650-712-0263 fax
www.hmbay.com | 650-479-9242 direct | 415-902-6112 cell
ebeffel for Skype | ebeffel@gmail.com GChat | ebeffel@me.com Facetime

From:	Secretary, Commissions (CPC)
To:	Johnson, Christine (CPC); Richards, Dennis (CPC); Koppel, Joel (CPC); Moore, Kathrin (CPC); Melgar, Myrna (CPC); richhillissf@yahoo.com; Rodney Fong
Cc:	Gerber, Patricia (CPC); Foster, Nicholas (CPC)
Subject:	FW: 8/31/17 Planning Commission - No. 12 -- 2017-002430CUA -- 948-950 Lombard & 841 Chestnut
Date:	Thursday, August 31, 2017 11:33:25 AM
Attachments:	948-950 Lombard-841 Chestnut.pdf
Importance:	High

Office of Commission Affairs

Planning Department | City & County of San Francisco
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, CA 94103
Direct: 415-558-6309 | Fax: 415-558-6409

commissions.secretary@sfgov.org
www.sfplanning.org

From: Kathleen Courtney [mailto:kcourtney@rhcasf.com]
Sent: Wednesday, August 30, 2017 10:58 PM
To: Commissioner Rich Hillis
Cc: Secretary, Commissions (CPC); Foster, Nicholas (CPC); Farrell, Mark (BOS); design@rhnsf.org; Robyn Tucker ; Jamie Cherry RHCA
Subject: 8/31/17 Planning Commission - No. 12 -- 2017-002430CUA -- 948-950 Lombard & 841 Chestnut
Importance: High

Commissioner Hillis, attached and pasted below is the Russian Hill Community Association request that the Conditional Use for this project be denied. We request that Commission Secretary Ionin distribute this letter to the Commissioners and Planner Foster note in his remarks to the Commission that this letter and other communications objecting to the CU request have been received.

Russian Hill Community Association

1166 Green St. San Francisco, CA 94109 510-928-8243 rhcasf.com

August 30, 2017

President Rich Hillis and
Members of the San Francisco Planning Commission
1650 Mission Street Room 400
San Francisco, CA 94103-2479

Re: 8/31/17 Planning Commission Agenda No. 12
Case No. 2017-002430CUA 948-950 Lombard Street & 841 Chestnut Street

Dear President Hillis and Members of the Planning Commission:

You need to read between the lines of the Executive Summary for the Conditional Use request

for a lot merger for the above project to realize that **there has been a massive failure of the Planning process resulting in the loss of a historic resource and potential significant negative impacts on the surrounding neighborhood.**

While the history of the project is less than clearly outlined, either deliberately or inadvertently, it is worth noting that the Executive Summary Project History identifies **12 separate applications/permits**. And more are listed on the Department of Building Inspection's database. Also significant are the **litany of errors, omissions, oversights and lack of coordination between Planning and the Department of Building Inspection noted in the Project History:**

- "Building Permit Application No. 2011.11.04.8277 was filed and approved on November 4, 2011, to correct the record and validate the approved permit at both legal properties."[Project History Par. 2]
- "Planning Department Staff approved the merger of the subject lots (Lots 10 and 17) on April 22, 2015 based upon incomplete information contained within the Department of Building Inspection (DBI) Report of Residential Building Record ("3-R Report). [Project History Par.5]
- "On April 2, 2016, a complaint was filed on the property regarding work beyond the scope of permit…On June 9, 2016, building Permit Application No. 2016.06.09.9584 was issued with an engineer's notice and no plans…No changes to approved design proposed." [Project History Par. 6]
- "On June 15, 2016, building Permit Application No. 2016.06.15.9992 was submitted with one sheet of plans illustrating the full removal of all historic material…The plans were approved by DBI without Planning Department review or approval." [Project History Par.6]
- "At the time all plans were submitted, the property had been effectively demolished; all permits were filed to correct the record." [Project History Par. 6]
- "On July 6, 2016, a complaint was filed with the Planning Department … citing the possible demolition of a historic resource without Planning Department approval…Planning Department Staff conducted a site visit on November 8, 2016, where it was determined that the building was composed of all new framing and sheathing." [Project History. Par 7]

The Russian Hill Community Association respectfully requests that the Planning Commission consider all of the facts and circumstances of this situation and deny the request for a lot merger.

Unfortunately, the stipulation in the settlement agreement requiring that all future permits be reviewed by the Planning Department and that the Project Sponsor not exceed the scope of work on approved permits does not provide the assurance that it should.

Violators of the Planning and Building Codes should not be rewarded. The requested merger of the two lots should be denied. Alternatives for access to the properties need to be explored. This is a precedent setting case and should not be addressed to simply clear the calendar. Please deny the Conditional Use request to merge two lots.

Sincerely,
Kathleen Courtney
Chair, Housing & Zoning Committee

Cc: Jamie Cherry, Jeff Cheney, RHCA; Robyn Tucker, PANA; Bob Bluhm, RHN; District 2 Supervisor Mark Farrell

From:	Secretary, Commissions (CPC)
To:	Gerber, Patricia (CPC)
Subject:	FW: 653 28th St DR Hearing, 9.7.17
Date:	Thursday, August 31, 2017 11:32:46 AM
Attachments:	LetterOfSupport_653_28th.pdf

Office of Commission Affairs

Planning Department | City & County of San Francisco
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, CA 94103
Direct: 415-558-6309 | Fax: 415-558-6409

commissions.secretary@sfgov.org
www.sfplanning.org

From: Nick Kim [mailto:marlmezzo@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, August 31, 2017 10:39 AM
To: richhillissf@gmail.com; Richards, Dennis (CPC); planning@rodneyfong.com; Johnson, Christine (CPC); Koppel, Joel (CPC); Melgar, Myrna (CPC); Moore, Kathrin (CPC); Secretary, Commissions (CPC); john@johnlumarchitecture.com; Gordon-Jonckheer, Elizabeth (CPC)
Subject: 653 28th St DR Hearing, 9.7.17

Hello,

I have recently learned of conflicts with respect to a proposed construction project on my block and I would like to lend my support to the project. Attached is my letter of support for the 653 28th Street project.

Regards,
Nick Kim

From:	Ionin, Jonas (CPC)
To:	Tran, Nancy (CPC)
Cc:	Gerber, Patricia (CPC)
Subject:	FW: Submission for 437 Hoffman Avenue. 2015-003686 DRP, hearing on September 14, 2017
Date:	Thursday, August 31, 2017 11:30:43 AM
Attachments:	2017-08-24 DR for 437 Hoffman, supplemental submission of petitioner Beffel (00609160xB2B8F).pdf

Jonas P. Ionin,
Director of Commission Affairs

Planning Department | City & County of San Francisco
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, CA 94103
Direct: 415-558-6309 | Fax: 415-558-6409

jonas.ionin@sfgov.org
www.sfplanning.org

From: Ernie Beffel [mailto:ebeffel@hmbay.com]
Sent: Thursday, August 24, 2017 1:51 PM
To: Secretary, Commissions (CPC); Ionin, Jonas (CPC)
Cc: richhillissf@yahoo.com; Richards, Dennis (CPC); planning@rodneyfong.com; Johnson, Christine (CPC); Koppel, Joel (CPC); Melgar, Myrna (CPC); Moore, Kathrin (CPC); kellymcondon@gmail.com; Chris Wine (chris.wine@teradata.com); Janet Fowler; Tran, Nancy (CPC); Washington, Delvin (CPC)
Subject: Submission for 437 Hoffman Avenue. 2015-003686 DRP, hearing on September 14, 2017

Dear Commissions Secretary:

Attached please find my supplemental submission to be included with supporting papers for the PC hearing in a few weeks. Please acknowledge receipt.

We reserve the right to file additional supplemental papers, if the project sponsor submits revised plans to Planning. To the best of my knowledge, the continuance requested by the developer has not resulted in submission to Planning of revised plans.

Our suggestion, made in prior submissions, remains for the project sponsor to scale back this project in line with 55 Homestead Street, an ongoing project similarly situated and within 200 feet of this site. While 3500 square feet is more than fifty percent larger than the average residence on Block 6503, it would be much more reasonable than 5350 square feet. Similarly, 35 feet over grade would be more reasonable than 53 feet over grade.

If you need an additional copy of my prior submission to include in the September meeting materials, please advise and I will send another copy.

Thank you.

Best regards,

Ernie Beffel

Haynes Beffel & Wolfeld LLP | PO Box 366, 637 Main St | Half Moon Bay, CA 94019
ebeffel@hmbay.com | 650-712-0340 phone | 650-712-0263 fax
www.hmbay.com | 650-479-9242 direct | 415-902-6112 cell
ebeffel for Skype | ebeffel@gmail.com GChat | ebeffel@me.com Facetime

From:	Secretary, Commissions (CPC)
To:	May, Christopher (CPC)
Cc:	Gerber, Patricia (CPC)
Subject:	FW: Planning Commission August 31, 2017 Item G15 Discretionary Review 116 10th Avenue -- 2016-000688DRP-02
Date:	Wednesday, August 30, 2017 1:43:47 PM

Office of Commission Affairs

Planning Department | City & County of San Francisco
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, CA 94103
Direct: 415-558-6309 | Fax: 415-558-6409

commissions.secretary@sfgov.org
www.sfplanning.org

From: Gerard Gleason [mailto:papergg@aol.com]
Sent: Wednesday, August 30, 2017 1:40 PM
To: richhillissf@gmail.com; Richards, Dennis (CPC); planning@rodneyfong.com; Johnson, Christine (CPC); Koppel, Joel (CPC); Melgar, Myrna (CPC); Moore, Kathrin (CPC); Secretary, Commissions (CPC)
Subject: Planning Commission August 31, 2017 Item G15 Discretionary Review 116 10th Avenue -- 2016-000688DRP-02

Planing Commission Meeting August 31, 2017
Item G15 Discretionary Review

RE 2016-000688DRP-02 (C. MAY: (415) 575-9087)
116 10th Avenue

Commissioners,

My family childhood home is the house at 114 10th Avenue. My brother Francis currently lives there with his family. The extended Gleason family uses the family home at 114 10th
Avenue for family gatherings. Our family has had members residing there since 1964.

The property next door at 116 10th Avenue has plans for massive enlargement. No one in our family begrudges someone remodeling and fixing up or even having reasonable additions and space added to that home. But the plans as submitted are way out of scale to anything nearby and would block sunlight and the feeling of reasonable open access to air and light. Personally, I cannot view the plans as submitted as anything other than a short-term business venture.

The submitted plans are for a massive home unlike any other on that block. Again we do not begrudge property owners fixing up homes, adding space to accommodate family and being part of the community. The Planning Commission, which should be working to address housing stock shortages in San Francisco, is spending an extraordinary amount of time reviewing permits for McMansions complete with Man-

Caves and Imelda Marcos shoe closets, rather than on well-planned dense housing. The entire extended Gleason family still resides in San Francisco at various properties around San Francisco, and most of us have raised families in 1000 square feet or less. I am not stating that all residents of San Francisco should do this. I am not being a NIMBY. But by allowing massive low occupant homes, and not building densely occupied homes, while preserving open space and access to sunlight and air, we are not building a sustainable San Francisco. Rather we are catering to special interests and large sums of money investing in real estate at the expense of community building.

Thank you for your time to review this.

Sincerely,

Gerard Gleason
100 2nd Avenue #4
San Francisco CA 94118

From:	Secretary, Commissions (CPC)
To:	Johnson, Christine (CPC); Richards, Dennis (CPC); Koppel, Joel (CPC); Moore, Kathrin (CPC); Melgar, Myrna (CPC); richhillissf@yahoo.com; Rodney Fong
Cc:	Perry, Andrew (CPC); Gerber, Patricia (CPC)
Subject:	FW: 2047 Polk St CUA demo objection
Date:	Wednesday, August 30, 2017 1:36:02 PM
Attachments:	Demo Objection 2049 Polk St.doc

Office of Commission Affairs

Planning Department | City & County of San Francisco
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, CA 94103
Direct: 415-558-6309 | Fax: 415-558-6409

commissions.secretary@sfgov.org
www.sfplanning.org

From: Jennifer Fieber [mailto:jennifer@sftu.org]
Sent: Wednesday, August 30, 2017 1:34 PM
To: Secretary, Commissions (CPC)
Subject: 2047 Polk St CUA demo objection

Dear Planning Secretary,

We would like our letter objecting to the removal two rent controlled housing units be included in the packet for the Planning Commission - Case No. 2015-015918CU, scheduled to be heard on Sept 14th, 2017..

Thank you very much,

Jennifer Fieber
SF Tenants Union

From:	Ionin, Jonas (CPC)
To:	Johnson, Christine (CPC); Richards, Dennis (CPC); Koppel, Joel (CPC); Moore, Kathrin (CPC); Melgar, Myrna (CPC); richhillissf@yahoo.com; Rodney Fong; Aaron Jon Hyland - HPC; Andrew Wolfram (andrew@tefarch.com); Diane Matsuda; Ellen Johnck - HPC; Jonathan Pearlman; Richard S. E. Johns
Cc:	Gerber, Patricia (CPC); Son, Chanbory (CPC)
Subject:	FW: *** PRESS RELEASE *** SAN FRANCISCO EXPANDS SERVICES FOR RESIDENTS DEALING WITH HOMELESSNESS, SUBSTANCE USE AND MENTAL HEALTH CHALLENGES
Date:	Wednesday, August 30, 2017 10:57:14 AM
Attachments:	8.30.2017 Hummingbird Opening.pdf

Jonas P. Ionin,
Director of Commission Affairs

Planning Department | City & County of San Francisco
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, CA 94103
Direct: 415-558-6309 | Fax: 415-558-6409

jonas.ionin@sfgov.org
www.sfplanning.org

From: MayorsPressOffice, MYR (MYR)
Sent: Wednesday, August 30, 2017 9:16 AM
To: MayorsPressOffice, MYR (MYR)
Subject: *** PRESS RELEASE *** SAN FRANCISCO EXPANDS SERVICES FOR RESIDENTS DEALING WITH HOMELESSNESS, SUBSTANCE USE AND MENTAL HEALTH CHALLENGES

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE:
Wednesday, August 30, 2017
Contact: Mayor's Office of Communications, 415-554-6131

*** PRESS RELEASE ***
SAN FRANCISCO EXPANDS SERVICES FOR RESIDENTS DEALING WITH HOMELESSNESS, SUBSTANCE USE AND MENTAL HEALTH CHALLENGES

New Hummingbird Navigation Center provides psychiatric respite and connections to care

San Francisco, CA – Mayor Edwin M. Lee and Public Health Director Barbara Garcia today announced the opening of a new 24-hour program at Hummingbird Place to provide respite and resources to care for San Francisco residents who are experiencing homelessness, mental health and substance use challenges.

The expanded program will offer respite, clinical and peer counseling, hot meals, showers and overnight accommodations to help clients regroup and find their footing after a crisis episode. Direct referrals to treatment will be available to Hummingbird Place clients.

"We are helping our most vulnerable residents break out of the cycle of streets and hospitalization," said Mayor Lee. "Hummingbird Place will provide the personalized care necessary to ensure that individuals have a chance to reclaim their lives and start anew. We are committed to addressing the root causes of homelessness, and providing treatments for behavioral health and substance use will help us reach that goal."

Hummingbird Place originally opened in 2015 as a day program providing peer counseling and support, which will continue. The new and expanded model of care adds multi-disciplinary staff, including professionals and peers. Clients may be referred from Zuckerberg San Francisco General Hospital, Psychiatric Emergency Services, the Homeless Outreach Team (SFHOT), the Encampment Resolution Team and community providers.

“The programs at Hummingbird Place will focus on those that are leaving psychiatric emergency care and also coming from the city's various homeless services,” said Barbara Garcia, Director of Health. “The program’s focus will be on helping homeless people that have had multiple visits to hospitals due to psychiatric and addiction crisis. At Hummingbird Place, they will find a safe and supportive environment, assistance with health and social services, medication management, benefits counseling and a place to spend the night.”

Hummingbird Place is part of the City’s Navigation Center system. A national model, Navigation Centers provide clients with access to intensive case management, critical service connection to healthcare, entitlement benefits, and drug treatment programs. More than 70 percent of residents who stay in Navigation Centers are successfully transitioned into permanent housing, safe temporary placements or reunited with family members. Hummingbird Place is the first Navigation Center in San Francisco specifically tailored for individuals experiencing mental health issues and addiction.

“The opening of the Hummingbird Navigation Center is yet another example of San Francisco’s ongoing commitment to addressing the complex issue of homelessness,” said Jeff Kositsky, director of the Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing. “Providing a safe place for people struggling with homelessness and serious health issues will help navigate some of our most vulnerable neighbors to the services and housing they so desperately need. I am deeply grateful for the leadership of Barbara Garcia and the hard work of everyone at the Department of Public Health who helped make this happen.”

The new program opens today with four beds and will expand to 15 beds by December. It will be managed by Positive Resource Center/Baker Places (PRC), a San Francisco provider with extensive experience caring for dual diagnoses (mental health and substance use) patients. Admissions will be by referral, managed by the San Francisco Health Network’s Transitions team, and will mirror the criteria used by the City’s navigation centers that allow for people to bring their belongings, pets and partners with them. Residents dealing with homelessness, as well as those who are marginally housed, will be eligible.

“As one of the only respite centers of its kind in the nation, Hummingbird Place is designed to help people who are not sick enough for the hospital, but they're too ill to live on the streets or stay in a homeless shelter,” said Brett Andrews, CEO of PRC. “By combining one-on-one peer support and professional staffing, this facility creates a unique short-term overnight model that fits well within our continuum of care practice.”

Hummingbird Place is located in the Behavioral Health Center next to the Zuckerberg San Francisco General Hospital campus. The BHC provides residential and outpatient services to adults with mental health and substance use needs, and is operated by the San Francisco Health Network, the care delivery system of the Department of Public Health.

Services provided at Hummingbird Place will include:

- Referral to primary care medical and psychiatric community providers
- Medication monitoring
- Linkage to social services
- Transportation to medical and social services appointments
- Hot meals
- Individual and group counseling
- One-on-one peer support
- Daily living skills training
- Provision of activities of daily living materials (i.e. clothing, showering, hygiene supplies, laundry facilities, etc.)
- Coordination of services and discharge planning

###

From:	Secretary, Commissions (CPC)
To:	Johnson, Christine (CPC); Richards, Dennis (CPC); Koppel, Joel (CPC); Moore, Kathrin (CPC); Melgar, Myrna (CPC); richhillissf@yahoo.com; Rodney Fong
Cc:	Gerber, Patricia (CPC)
Subject:	FW: 948-950 LOMBARD / 841 CHESTNUT -- PLANNING COMMISSION THURSDAY 08-31-2017 ITEM 12 -- #2017-002430CUA
Date:	Wednesday, August 30, 2017 10:54:42 AM

Office of Commission Affairs

Planning Department | City & County of San Francisco
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, CA 94103
Direct: 415-558-6309 | Fax: 415-558-6409

commissions.secretary@sfgov.org
www.sfplanning.org

From: Richard Cardello [mailto:richard@cardellodesign.com]
Sent: Tuesday, August 29, 2017 4:51 PM
To: Secretary, Commissions (CPC)
Cc: Foster, Nicholas (CPC)
Subject: 948-950 LOMBARD / 841 CHESTNUT -- PLANNING COMMISSION THURSDAY 08-31-2017 ITEM 12 -- #2017-002430CUA

Jonas P. Ionin
Commission Secretary
San Francisco Planning Department
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400
San Francisco, CA 94103
PH: (415) 558-6415 (Assistant)
PH: (415) 558-6309 (Direct)
FX: (415) 558-6409
Commissions.Secretary@sfgov.org

Nicholas Foster
(415) 575-9167
Nicholas.Foster@sfgov.org

RE: 2017-002430CUA

The fine levied for the egregious and unauthorized demolition of the Willis Polk structure seems way too small, especially when considering the estimated value of the completed project; the fine is just a relatively small, cost-of-doing-business expense.
My personal feeling is that the developer forfeited any consideration and, under the circumstances, doesn't deserve the granting of any additional benefits from San Francisco's Planning Department, such as the approval of a lot merger or a conditional use application.
Rather, the City should decide solely on the basis of what would be better for the Russian Hill neighborhood and for the City of San Francisco and rule that way; no consideration should be given

to the developer's wishes nor any potential increased profit.

Richard Cardello
999 GREEN STREET NO. 903
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94133

From:	Secretary, Commissions (CPC)
To:	Johnson, Christine (CPC); Richards, Dennis (CPC); Koppel, Joel (CPC); Moore, Kathrin (CPC); Melgar, Myrna (CPC); richhillissf@yahoo.com; Rodney Fong
Cc:	Gerber, Patricia (CPC)
Subject:	FW: 948-950 LOMBARD / 841 CHESTNUT -- PLANNING COMMISSION THURSDAY 08-31-2017 ITEM 12 -- #2017-002430CUA
Date:	Tuesday, August 29, 2017 5:09:40 PM

Office of Commission Affairs

Planning Department | City & County of San Francisco
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, CA 94103
Direct: 415-558-6309 | Fax: 415-558-6409

commissions.secretary@sfgov.org
www.sfplanning.org

From: Richard Cardello [mailto:richard@cardellodesign.com]
Sent: Tuesday, August 29, 2017 4:51 PM
To: Secretary, Commissions (CPC)
Cc: Foster, Nicholas (CPC)
Subject: 948-950 LOMBARD / 841 CHESTNUT -- PLANNING COMMISSION THURSDAY 08-31-2017 ITEM 12 -- #2017-002430CUA

Jonas P. Ionin
Commission Secretary
San Francisco Planning Department
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400
San Francisco, CA 94103
PH: (415) 558-6415 (Assistant)
PH: (415) 558-6309 (Direct)
FX: (415) 558-6409
Commissions.Secretary@sfgov.org

Nicholas Foster
(415) 575-9167
Nicholas.Foster@sfgov.org

RE: 2017-002430CUA

The fine levied for the egregious and unauthorized demolition of the Willis Polk structure seems way too small, especially when considering the estimated value of the completed project; the fine is just a relatively small, cost-of-doing-business expense.
My personal feeling is that the developer forfeited any consideration and, under the circumstances, doesn't deserve the granting of any additional benefits from San Francisco's Planning Department, such as the approval of a lot merger or a conditional use application.
Rather, the City should decide solely on the basis of what would be better for the Russian Hill neighborhood and for the City of San Francisco and rule that way; no consideration should be given

to the developer's wishes nor any potential increased profit.

Richard Cardello
999 GREEN STREET NO. 903
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94133

From:	Ionin, Jonas (CPC)
To:	Johnson, Christine (CPC); Richards, Dennis (CPC); Koppel, Joel (CPC); Moore, Kathrin (CPC); Melgar, Myrna (CPC); richhillissf@yahoo.com; Rodney Fong
Cc:	May, Christopher (CPC); Gerber, Patricia (CPC)
Subject:	FW: Correction for 650 Divisadero Project
Date:	Tuesday, August 29, 2017 4:48:35 PM

Jonas P. Ionin,
Director of Commission Affairs

Planning Department | City & County of San Francisco
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, CA 94103
Direct: 415-558-6309 | Fax: 415-558-6409

jonas.ionin@sfgov.org
www.sfplanning.org

From: Donna Thomson [mailto:justafoodie@yahoo.com]
Sent: Tuesday, August 29, 2017 4:23 PM
To: Ionin, Jonas (CPC); cpccommissionsecretary@sfgov.org
Subject: Correction for 650 Divisadero Project

Re: Planning Commission Meeting set for September 28, 2017

Project: 650 Divisadero St

Adjacent Property: 1265 Grove St

August 29, 2017

Dear Mr Ionin,

I need your help. Since I have never heard from any of the Planning Commissioners concerning my proposed site visit invitation, encouraged by Commissioner Richards, mailed on March 24, 2017, today I'm sending out another invitation without my letter, just a short list of my concerns. Since I believe it imperative that someone sees the site, to fully understand my concerns, and to be able to visualize the problems as they relate to the proposed plan, I am asking you to forward my complete thoughts to the commissioners.

Here is my formal letter:

Commissioner Richards suggested to me in July 2016 when the meeting for this project was postponed until October, that I write a letter for the record and might request that members of the commission come to our property, since I would be out of town in October. The hearing dates were changed in October.

Our property at 1265 Grove was the most adversely impacted by the proposed project. On March 24th 2017 I emailed my invitation with a 2nd letter to each member of the Planning Commission and have not received a single response thus far.

My original letter found its way to the back of a packet for the project that was put together expressly for the Planning Commission to review. I was more than disappointed and discouraged that it was relegated to the very last page of about 100 pages of public comment, many of which were written by people who do not even live in the neighborhood. I have to wonder if any of you even saw it, with so much to read.

I have 5 major concerns and unless there is a site visit, I do not believe the commissioners could

visualize the unique problems the plans, as currently proposed, would cause to our building. My concerns include:

- **undermining of our foundation and potential theft.**

- the proposed **7' Privacy fence on the property line**

- sound being funneled into our building

- killing of our 4 storey tree

- 7 day per week construction

Concerns about our foundation being undermined can be alleviated by the current wall between the 2 properties remaining in place and being strengthened, as proposed to us by the Szetos at a meeting in March of this year. This would also eliminate access to our property, which is protected by that wall, and the possibility of theft because our tenants' back doors would be left exposed without the wall.

Concerns about light may be alleviated somewhat with their plan to build 6'–10' from the property line starting at our light well, but creating a 7' privacy screen at the property line will eliminate some of that light gain. Our tenants' **large dining room windows are 4' from the property line** (see photos #65 the window on the left is the kitchen window, that in the center is the side dining room window. The large dining room window is actually closer to the property line by 2' instead of 4'), so this is a claustrophobic prospect. My suggestion is to require that the planters and privacy fence be moved 5' from the property line and the screening be required to prevent falling, not to obstruct the little light we will have left. Their 18' setback from the property line on the 2 top floors does precious little for light, since they are above our roofline. On our block, the corner building on Divisadero and the north side of Grove, which looms over a much shorter building is set 3' back from the property line, allowing the owner of the shorter building access to the side of his building for painting and other repairs. I would like this same consideration (see photos #112 & #113).

With this new building going up near the Independent nightclub, the amplification of sound is inevitable. While the property owners at 650 Divisadero believe any noise issues would be better addressed by the nightclub, I believe the 6 stories of their building proposed at the property line with the club will create a funnel for sound going directly into our building by way of their rear yard setback. For that reason my husband and I are requesting a **discretionary review of sound** as it would impact our building.

Their plans to dig below grade at the property line will damage and most likely kill our walnut tree which stands 4 1/2 stories tall and spans over 75', because part of the root system supporting the weight of the tree is under their current foundation. This would expose us to massive liability law suits should the tree die from mishandling and fall, damaging neighboring properties. My suggestion is to require a **tree protection plan overseen by a consulting arborist**, not a certified arborist, **and a significant bond** that would protect us financially, if the tree dies within 5 years of the construction. I would urge the commission to **deny the rear yard setback variance** being sought **unless this provision was met by the owners of 650 Grove St**. If the rear yard were on the ground floor as it should be according to building code, since residential units start there, my tree roots would not be damaged. The variance is being sought to allow stacked parking in the critical root zone of our tree. Besides the damage to roots by cutting through them, compaction of soil is also a significant way to kill a tree. Allowing building materials and equipment to sit over the root zone can kill the roots. To protect a tree, the **root zone needs 10 feet beyond the canopy to be protected** from damage by digging and weight that compacts the earth around it. This would go 35' past the property line into 650 Divisadero.

We have already lost 2 parties being offered our units, who rejected them because of the inevitable loss of light and views, but also for the building construction which we have been informed will be 7 days per week. The sunlight flooding our kitchens and dining rooms, the sunset views, and our tree have been the features that have made our building unique in this area and of interest to renters. Do we need to also lose long term tenants because of construction noise on weekends, in addition to losing sunlight, views and possibly the tree? We are located on a **residential street**

and believe 7 day per week construction is unacceptable.

I feel the cost to us as adjacent neighbors is too much and request some consideration from the commission. How much are we as neighbors expected to pay and or lose for the success of this enterprise?

Sincerely,

Donna Thomson

415 567-6858

Download all attachments as a zip file

- 
  DSC00070.JPG
  150.7kB

- 

DSC00065.JPG
147kB

- 
  DSC00064.JPG
  150.9kB

- 
  DSC00078.JPG
  151.2kB

DSC00113.JPG
148.8kB

DSC00112.JPG
146.1kB

From:	Ionin, Jonas (CPC)
To:	Johnson, Christine (CPC); Richards, Dennis (CPC); Koppel, Joel (CPC); Moore, Kathrin (CPC); Melgar, Myrna (CPC); richhillissf@yahoo.com; Rodney Fong
Cc:	Gerber, Patricia (CPC)
Subject:	FW: 650 Grove Project
Date:	Tuesday, August 29, 2017 4:25:46 PM

Jonas P. Ionin,
Director of Commission Affairs

Planning Department | City & County of San Francisco
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, CA 94103
Direct: 415-558-6309 | Fax: 415-558-6409

jonas.ionin@sfgov.org
www.sfplanning.org

From: Donna Thomson [mailto:justafoodie@yahoo.com]
Sent: Tuesday, August 29, 2017 4:17 PM
To: Ionin, Jonas (CPC); cpccommissionsecretary@sfgov.com
Subject: 650 Grove Project

Re: Planning Commission Meeting set for September 28, 2017

Project: 650 Grove St

Adjacent Property: 1265 Grove St

August 29, 2017

Dear Mr Ionin,

I need your help. Since I have never heard from any of the Planning Commissioners concerning my proposed site visit invitation, encouraged by Commissioner Richards, mailed on March 24, 2017, today I'm sending out another invitation without my letter, just a short list of my concerns. Since I believe it imperative that someone sees the site, to fully understand my concerns, and to be able to visualize the problems as they relate to the proposed plan, I am asking you to forward my complete thoughts to the commissioners.

Here is my formal letter:

Commissioner Richards suggested to me in July 2016 when the meeting for this project was postponed until October, that I write a letter for the record and might request that members of the commission come to our property, since I would be out of town in October. The hearing dates were changed in October.

Our property at 1265 Grove was the most adversely impacted by the proposed project. On March 24th 2017 I emailed my invitation with a 2nd letter to each member of the Planning Commission and have not received a single response thus far.

My original letter found its way to the back of a packet for the project that was put

together expressly for the Planning Commission to review. I was more than disappointed and discouraged that it was relegated to the very last page of about 100 pages of public comment, many of which were written by people who do not even live in the neighborhood. I have to wonder if any of you even saw it, with so much to read.

I have 5 major concerns and unless there is a site visit, I do not believe the commissioners could visualize the unique problems the plans, as currently proposed, would cause to our building. My concerns include:

- **undermining of our foundation and potential theft.**

- the proposed **7' Privacy fence on the property line**

- sound being funneled into our building

- killing of our 4 storey tree

- 7 day per week construction

Concerns about our foundation being undermined can be alleviated by the current wall between the 2 properties remaining in place and being strengthened, as proposed to us by the Szetos at a meeting in March of this year. This would also eliminate access to our property, which is protected by that wall, and the possibility of theft because our tenants' back doors would be left exposed without the wall.

Concerns about light may be alleviated somewhat with their plan to build 6'–10' from the property line starting at our light well, but creating a 7' privacy screen at the property line will eliminate some of that light gain. Our tenants' **large dining room windows are 4' from the property line** (see photos #65 the window on the left is the kitchen window, that in the center is the side dining room window. The large dining room window is actually closer to the property line by 2' instead of 4'), so this is a claustrophobic prospect. My suggestion is to require that the planters and privacy fence be moved 5' from the property line and the screening be required to prevent falling, not to obstruct the little light we will have left. Their 18' setback from the property line on the 2 top floors does precious little for light, since they are above our roofline. On our block, the corner building on Divisadero and the north side of Grove, which looms over a much shorter building is set 3' back from the property line, allowing the owner of the shorter building access to the side of his building for painting and other repairs. I would like this same consideration (see photos #112 & #113).

With this new building going up near the Independent nightclub, the amplification of sound is inevitable. While the property owners at 650 Divisadero believe any noise issues would be better addressed by the nightclub, I believe the 6 stories of their building proposed at the property line with the club will create a funnel for sound going directly into our building by way of their rear yard setback. For that reason my husband and I are requesting a **discretionary review of sound** as it would impact our building.

Their plans to dig below grade at the property line will damage and most likely kill our walnut tree which stands 4 1/2 stories tall and spans over 75', because part of the root system supporting the weight of the tree is under their current foundation. This would expose us to massive liability law suits should the tree die from mishandling and fall, damaging neighboring properties. My suggestion is to require a **tree protection plan overseen by a consulting arborist**, not a certified arborist, **and a significant bond** that would protect us financially, if the tree dies within 5 years of the construction. I would urge the commission to **deny the rear yard setback variance** being sought **unless this provision was met by the owners of 650 Grove St**. If the rear yard were on the ground floor as it should be according to building code, since residential units start there,

my tree roots would not be damaged. The variance is being sought to allow stacked parking in the critical root zone of our tree. Besides the damage to roots by cutting through them, compaction of soil is also a significant way to kill a tree. Allowing building materials and equipment to sit over the root zone can kill the roots. To protect a tree, the **root zone needs 10 feet beyond the canopy to be protected** from damage by digging and weight that compacts the earth around it. This would go 35' past the property line into 650 Divisadero.

We have already lost 2 parties being offered our units, who rejected them because of the inevitable loss of light and views, but also for the building construction which we have been informed will be 7 days per week. The sunlight flooding our kitchens and dining rooms, the sunset views, and our tree have been the features that have made our building unique in this area and of interest to renters. Do we need to also lose long term tenants because of construction noise on weekends, in addition to losing sunlight, views and possibly the tree? We are located on a **residential street** and believe 7 day per week construction is unacceptable.

I feel the cost to us as adjacent neighbors is too much and request some consideration from the commission. How much are we as neighbors expected to pay and or lose for the success of this enterprise?

Sincerely,

Donna Thomson

415 567-6858

From:	Ionin, Jonas (CPC)
To:	Johnson, Christine (CPC); Richards, Dennis (CPC); Koppel, Joel (CPC); Moore, Kathrin (CPC); Melgar, Myrna (CPC); richhillissf@yahoo.com; Rodney Fong; Aaron Jon Hyland - HPC; Andrew Wolfram (andrew@tefarch.com); Diane Matsuda; Ellen Johnck - HPC; Jonathan Pearlman; Richard S. E. Johns
Cc:	Gerber, Patricia (CPC); Son, Chanbory (CPC)
Subject:	FW: August 26 – Thank you from Mayor Lee
Date:	Tuesday, August 29, 2017 3:17:48 PM

Jonas P. Ionin,
Director of Commission Affairs

Planning Department | City & County of San Francisco
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, CA 94103
Direct: 415-558-6309 | Fax: 415-558-6409

jonas.ionin@sfgov.org
www.sfplanning.org

From: Lee, Mayor (MYR)
Sent: Monday, August 28, 2017 6:00 PM
Subject: August 26 – Thank you from Mayor Lee

Dear City Employee:

This weekend, San Francisco stood together to reject hate and violence. Throughout our city, the themes of love and compassion were on full display.

I am incredibly grateful to all the public safety agencies who worked tirelessly to keep our city safe: police officers, firefighters, EMS workers, 911 emergency dispatchers, and deputy sheriffs.

I want to thank all our City employees who worked in support of this weekend's gatherings, ensuring everyone remained safe: Recreation and Parks, Public Works, Department of Public Health, Municipal Transportation Agency, 311, and many others.

I want to offer profound thanks to our residents, community groups, faith-based representatives, labor organizations, advocates and members of the Board of Supervisors who led and participated in rallies of unity and love.

There were zero injuries related to the demonstrations on Saturday, despite the potential for violence that we have seen in other cities when similar protests have been held.

This year, we are celebrating the 50th anniversary of the Summer of Love. We proved this weekend that the legacy of that movement remains strong, half a century later.

Sincerely,
Edwin M. Lee
Mayor, City & County of San Francisco

From:	Ionin, Jonas (CPC)
To:	Johnson, Christine (CPC); Richards, Dennis (CPC); Koppel, Joel (CPC); Moore, Kathrin (CPC); Melgar, Myrna (CPC); Rich Hillis; Rodney Fong; Aaron Jon Hyland - HPC; Andrew Wolfram (andrew@tefarch.com); Diane Matsuda; Ellen Johnck - HPC; Jonathan Pearlman; Richard S. E. Johns
Cc:	Son, Chanbory (CPC); Gerber, Patricia (CPC)
Subject:	FW: *** UPDATE *** MAYOR LEE ON DEVELOPMENTS RELATED TO AUGUST 26 RALLY
Date:	Monday, August 28, 2017 9:34:05 AM
Attachments:	8.25.17 UPDATE August 26 Rally Developments.pdf

Jonas P. Ionin,
Director of Commission Affairs

Planning Department | City & County of San Francisco
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, CA 94103
Direct: 415-558-6309 | Fax: 415-558-6409

jonas.ionin@sfgov.org
www.sfplanning.org

From: MayorsPressOffice, MYR (MYR)
Sent: Friday, August 25, 2017 10:04 PM
Subject: *** UPDATE *** MAYOR LEE ON DEVELOPMENTS RELATED TO AUGUST 26 RALLY

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE:
Friday, August 25, 2017
Contact: Mayor's Office of Communications, 415-554-6131

*** UPDATE ***
MAYOR LEE ON DEVELOPMENTS RELATED TO AUGUST 26 RALLY

"The Golden Gate National Recreation Area has confirmed that the Patriot Prayer group has relinquished the permit for a rally at Crissy Field on Saturday at 2 p.m.

Public safety is always our top priority. The San Francisco Police Department and our City's public safety agencies are prepared for any contingencies and spontaneous events. San Francisco does not welcome outside agitators whose messages of hate have the sole purpose of inciting violence.

No permits have been requested or issued for Alamo Square this weekend. SFPD will have an enhanced presence at Alamo Square and in the surrounding neighborhoods. I want to reinforce that existing San Francisco law prohibits firearms and weapons in city parks. Those who seek to commit acts of violence or damage property will be arrested and prosecuted.

We continue to encourage residents to attend peaceful gatherings and not engage with those who seek to disrupt our communities. Today, we showed the world what peace and unity looks like. We stood together and stated resoundingly that San Francisco is a city of love and

compassion and does not tolerate hate.”

###

From:	Ionin, Jonas (CPC)
To:	Johnson, Christine (CPC); Richards, Dennis (CPC); Koppel, Joel (CPC); Moore, Kathrin (CPC); Melgar, Myrna (CPC); Rich Hillis; Rodney Fong; Aaron Jon Hyland - HPC; Andrew Wolfram (andrew@tefarch.com); Diane Matsuda; Ellen Johnck - HPC; Jonathan Pearlman; Richard S. E. Johns
Cc:	Gerber, Patricia (CPC); Son, Chanbory (CPC)
Subject:	FW: *** STATEMENT *** MAYOR LEE ON THE PEACEFUL EVENTS OF AUGUST 26
Date:	Monday, August 28, 2017 9:33:06 AM
Attachments:	8.26.17 Peaceful Events of Aug 26.pdf

Jonas P. Ionin,
Director of Commission Affairs

Planning Department | City & County of San Francisco
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, CA 94103
Direct: 415-558-6309 | Fax: 415-558-6409

jonas.ionin@sfgov.org
www.sfplanning.org

From: MayorsPressOffice, MYR (MYR)
Sent: Saturday, August 26, 2017 7:14 PM
Subject: *** STATEMENT *** MAYOR LEE ON THE PEACEFUL EVENTS OF AUGUST 26

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE:
Saturday, August 26, 2017
Contact: Mayor's Office of Communications, 415-554-6131

*** STATEMENT ***
MAYOR LEE ON THE PEACEFUL EVENTS OF AUGUST 26

"Today, the people of San Francisco, once again, peacefully united to reject hate and violence.

I want to thank the residents, the community groups, the activists, members of the Board of Supervisors and all San Franciscans that led and participated in peaceful gatherings and marches. Throughout our city the theme of love and compassion loudly dominated the rhetoric of hate and violence.

I am incredibly grateful to all the public safety agencies who continue to work hard this evening to keep our city safe: police officers, firefighters, EMS workers, 911 emergency dispatchers, deputy sheriffs and highway patrol officers. Thank you to the city employees that dedicated so much effort to the many peaceful gatherings around the city: Recreation and Park, Public Works, Department of Public Health, Municipal Transportation Agency, among others.

This year, we are celebrating the 50th anniversary of the Summer of Love. The events of today prove that the legacy of that movement remains strong, half a century later.

###

*** *To view Mayor Lee and San Francisco Police Chief Scott's comments on the events of today:*
https://twitter.com/mayoredlee/status/901591634550202368

From:	Ionin, Jonas (CPC)
To:	Johnson, Christine (CPC); Richards, Dennis (CPC); Koppel, Joel (CPC); Moore, Kathrin (CPC); Melgar, Myrna (CPC); Rich Hillis; Rodney Fong; Aaron Jon Hyland - HPC; Andrew Wolfram (andrew@tefarch.com); Diane Matsuda; Ellen Johnck - HPC; Jonathan Pearlman; Richard S. E. Johns
Cc:	Gerber, Patricia (CPC); Son, Chanbory (CPC)
Subject:	FW: Commission Update for Week of August 28, 2017
Date:	Monday, August 28, 2017 9:32:55 AM
Attachments:	Commission Weekly Update 8.28.17.doc

Jonas P. Ionin,
Director of Commission Affairs

Planning Department | City & County of San Francisco
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, CA 94103
Direct: 415-558-6309 | Fax: 415-558-6409

jonas.ionin@sfgov.org
www.sfplanning.org

From: Tsang, Francis
Sent: Monday, August 28, 2017 9:16 AM
To: Tsang, Francis
Subject: Commission Update for Week of August 28, 2017

Colleagues,

Please find a memo attached that outlines items before commissions and boards for this week. Let me know if you have any questions or concerns.

Thanks!
Francis

Francis Tsang
Deputy Chief of Staff
Office of Mayor Edwin M. Lee
415.554.6467 | francis.tsang@sfgov.org

Get Connected with Mayor Ed Lee
www.sfmayor.org
Twitter @mayoredlee

From:	Secretary, Commissions (CPC)
To:	Johnson, Christine (CPC); Richards, Dennis (CPC); Koppel, Joel (CPC); Moore, Kathrin (CPC); Melgar, Myrna (CPC); Rich Hillis; Rodney Fong
Cc:	Gerber, Patricia (CPC)
Subject:	FW: PC meeting 8/24/17- agenda items 21, 22
Date:	Monday, August 28, 2017 8:56:32 AM

Office of Commission Affairs

Planning Department | City & County of San Francisco
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, CA 94103
Direct: 415-558-6309 | Fax: 415-558-6409

commissions.secretary@sfgov.org
www.sfplanning.org

From: Charles Pappas [mailto:nberkhills@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Friday, August 25, 2017 1:38 PM
To: Secretary, Commissions (CPC)
Cc: Sider, Dan (CPC); Kim, Jane (BOS); Lopez, Barbara (BOS); Cohen, Malia (BOS)
Subject: PC meeting 8/24/17- agenda items 21, 22

Dear Planning Commissioners,

Some comments and FYI regarding yesterday's meeting and related cannabis issues to follow:

- Thank you for not continuing these applications until next month, and for your eventual Vapor Room Collective approval later in the evening which I was unable to attend and offer public comment.
- Earlier reasoning for continuing the items based on upcoming changes in state law- FYI, the Bureau of Cannabis Control (formerly Bureau of Medical Cannabis Regulation) from the outset of forming regulations has encouraged local jurisdictions / municipalities to enact their own regulations, including licensing (dispensing, cultivation, edibles, etc.) and that licensed entities before Jan. 1 2018 would receive priority state licensing consideration, which will be required.
- Additionally, it is noteworthy that current proposed BCC regulations do not provide for adult use distribution in medical cannabis dispensaries, which seemed a topic of concern earlier yesterday.
- Finally, I am opposed to the medical cannabis dispensary moratorium. Well regulated SF is a model for medical cannabis oversight. "Green zoning" leaves patients under served in many sections of the city. The current review process has protected neighbors and community, but reasonable exceptions should be found to accommodate the needs of patients.

Of course, I recognize and thank your commission for your vast important considerations and impressive work load.

Respectfully
Charley Pappas- vice chairman, Berkeley Cannabis Commission
co-founder, chairman, Divinity Tree Patients Wellness Coop, SF (2005-2012)

From:	Secretary, Commissions (CPC)
To:	Gerber, Patricia (CPC)
Subject:	FW: Case No. 2013.1543, 1979 Mission Street Mixed-Use Project
Date:	Friday, August 25, 2017 10:24:03 AM

Office of Commission Affairs

Planning Department | City & County of San Francisco
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, CA 94103
Direct: 415-558-6309 | Fax: 415-558-6409

commissions.secretary@sfgov.org
www.sfplanning.org

From: Julian [mailto:penrosejd@aol.com]
Sent: Friday, August 25, 2017 10:11 AM
To: richhillissf@yahoo.com; Richards, Dennis (CPC); planning@rodneyfong.com; Johnson, Christine (CPC); Koppel, Joel (CPC); Melgar, Myrna (CPC); Moore, Kathrin (CPC); Secretary, Commissions (CPC)
Cc: Lee, Mayor (MYR); Ronen, Hillary; Allbee, Nate; Rahaim, John (CPC); Sucre, Richard (CPC); Dwyer, Debra (CPC); andy@plaza16.org
Subject: RE: Case No. 2013.1543, 1979 Mission Street Mixed-Use Project

Dear President Hillis and Planning Commissioners,

My name is Julian Penrose. I live (in a BMR unit), work, and vote in the city of San Francisco. I am writing to express my strong opposition to the project proposed for 1979 Mission Street by Maximus Real Estate Partners, known widely as the "Monster in the Mission." As you know, the Mission District is facing a dire crisis of community and cultural displacement. To address this crisis, we must prioritize deeply affordable housing at this site, not a project of mostly luxury-priced housing that will further accelerate gentrification and the displacement of the existing residents, SRO hotels, mom and pop businesses, nonprofit organizations, arts and cultural spaces, PDR spaces etc. I urge you to recognize the urgent crisis facing the neighborhood, acknowledge the impact of the current massive and unsustainable imbalance of market-rate vs. affordable development in the neighborhood, and reject this project outright.

Furthermore, the Maximus project would have a significant negative impact on the Marshall Elementary School community. Not only would almost none of the housing in the project be affordable to the majority of families and employees at this Spanish immersion school, the project would also cast a shadow over the school's playground for most of the school day. For many students this playground is their primary outdoor recreational space. The developer's proposal to raise the playground would not sufficiently mitigate the shadow impact. We stand with the many Marshall community members who oppose this project due to its unaffordability and student-harming shadow impacts.

With the overwhelming influx of market-rate development across the Mission, we must prioritize affordable housing at all remaining building sites. Yet as 16th and Mission is one of the City's busiest public transportation hubs, affordable housing there is even more essential. Recent research confirms that low income households use public transit at much higher rates than higher income households that drive and/or use car shares at much higher rates. Therefore, building deeply affordable versus market-rate housing at 16th and Mission would benefit the environment and our city with reduced greenhouse emissions and less street congestion!

The Maximus project would exacerbate the Mission's displacement crisis, would cast both a metaphorical and literal shadow of the Marshall School community, and would likely result in both increased pollution and traffic. Instead of the Monster, I support a plan for the site such as the "Marvel," the community serving project envisioned and created with input from over **300 community members via a grassroots year-long process** anchored by the Plaza 16 Coalition. I strongly urge you to fulfill your sacred duty as city planners and use your significant power to reject an unaffordable,

community-harming Monster in the Mission and instead advocate for an affordable, community-serving Marvel.

Sincerely,

Julian Penrose