

From: [Secretary, Commissions \(CPC\)](#)
To: [Christensen, Michael \(CPC\)](#)
Cc: [Feliciano, Josephine \(CPC\)](#)
Subject: FW: In Support of 792 Capp Street
Date: Thursday, May 17, 2018 10:27:22 AM

*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: cesar love [mailto:cesarlove714@hotmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, May 17, 2018 10:16 AM
To: richhillissf@gmail.com; myra.melgar@sfgov.org; planning@rodneymfong.com; Johnson, Millicent (CPC); Koppel, Joel (CPC); Moore, Kathrin (CPC); Richards, Dennis (CPC); Secretary, Commissions (CPC)
Subject: In Support of 792 Capp Street

Dear Friends:

I have lived near the corner of 23rd and Capp since 1994. I am writing to express my opinion to stop the demolition of 792 Capp Street. I spoke to the developers on a weekend morning when they were in front of the building giving away donuts and coffee, in order to gather signatures for their project. They stated that the rent for their planned building would be market rate (I can't remember the exact number, but something like \$4000 a month), which is nothing that any longtime neighborhood resident could afford. New housing should be affordable to middle and working class residents.

I am also very concerned about trends in the immediate neighborhood. An old building on Capp Street was recently demolished between 23rd and 24th Street. It is being replaced with a pretty ugly 3 or 4 story building.

It is also now very difficult to park in our neighborhood. At night, sometimes it takes me 45 minutes to find a parking spot where I won't receive a ticket the next morning. (And this is with a residential permit.) New multiple units just add to the congestion, even if they promise parking for their residents. The neighborhood is much denser than it used to be and it is much more difficult to park than just a few years ago.

The current building on 792 Capp has charm and character, something that the neighborhood is losing, and the City is losing. It is heartbreaking to see nice old buildings like it being torn down.

A concerned neighbor,

Cesar Love
3219 23rd Street.# 9

From: [Secretary, Commissions \(CPC\)](#)
To: [Richards, Dennis \(CPC\)](#); [Johnson, Milicent \(CPC\)](#); [Koppel, Joel \(CPC\)](#); [Moore, Kathrin \(CPC\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(CPC\)](#); planning@rodneyfong.com; [Rich Hillis](#)
Cc: [Feliciano, Josephine \(CPC\)](#); [Ajello Hoagland, Linda \(CPC\)](#)
Subject: FW: Writing in support of Discretionary Review of 1863 Mission Street
Date: Thursday, May 17, 2018 9:19:41 AM

*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: Jessica Ainsworth [mailto:jessica_ainsworth@hotmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, May 16, 2018 9:07 PM
Subject: Writing in support of Discretionary Review of 1863 Mission Street

Dear planning

I am writing to encourage you to do a discretionary review of 1863 Mission Street due to the low percentage of affordable housing in its application.

I have been adversely affected by the very quick gentrification of San Francisco in losing my place of residence of 23 years in Potrero Hill through a no fault eviction. I was able to get a BMR unit at 1875 Mission due to an ordinance passed by the supervisors that allowed long-term renters evicted in this manner to jump the lottery line. At the time the median income that you couldn't earn over in order to qualify for a BMR in San Francisco was around \$20,000 lower than it is now, so the pool I was competing against was smaller. I was able to get a place fairly quickly in the scheme of things, most likely due to this. At this time, I would probably need to wait much longer. I am interested in giving others in my position a similar chance in continuing to live in San Francisco to the one I had.

I work at San Francisco General Hospital through UCSF where I am the scheduler of their General Medical Clinic. This is a big, difficult job that doesn't bring in a lot of money. If I had not been able to get a BMR, I would most likely have a long, draining commute from areas far from San Francisco at this time, which would have made me less effective at my job in addition to diminishing my quality of life.

I would like it if the developer would:

- build a project that includes benefits to the community in which he is making his profit

for himself and his investors

- increase the inclusionary affordable housing by adding additional BMR units or adding federally subsidized housing units through a partnership with Brilliant Corners
- provide a long term lease for the commercial space at \$2/SF to a community serving business such as a neighborhood non-profit
- alter the facade of the commercial space to bring the windows more in character with the cultural and architectural context of Mission Street

Sincerely,

Jessica Ainsworth

From: [Ionin, Jonas \(CPC\)](#)
To: [Richards, Dennis \(CPC\)](#); [Johnson, Milicent \(CPC\)](#); [Koppel, Joel \(CPC\)](#); [Moore, Kathrin \(CPC\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(CPC\)](#); planning@rodneyfong.com; [Rich Hillis](#)
Cc: [Feliciano, Josephine \(CPC\)](#)
Subject: FW: CPC 5/17 - Supplemental memo for immediate transmittal
Date: Thursday, May 17, 2018 9:05:09 AM
Attachments: [Supplemental Memorandum to CPC 5.16.18.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: Bintliff, Jacob (CPC)
Sent: Wednesday, May 16, 2018 5:13 PM
To: CTYPLN - COMMISSION SECRETARY
Cc: Conner, Kate (CPC)
Subject: CPC 5/17 - Supplemental memo for immediate transmittal

Dear Commission Affairs –

Could you please send the attached supplemental memo and attachments to **Planning** Commissioners asap, as they will be hearing this item tomorrow May 17, and also upload this to the website as a correspondence for tomorrow's hearing?

This is re: 2018-004633PCA.

Thank you!

Jacob

Jacob Bintliff, MCP
Senior Planner

San Francisco Planning Department
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400 San Francisco, CA 94103
Direct: 415.575.9170 | www.sfplanning.org
[San Francisco Property Information Map](#)

From: [Ionin, Jonas \(CPC\)](#)
To: [Richards, Dennis \(CPC\)](#); [Johnson, Milicent \(CPC\)](#); [Koppel, Joel \(CPC\)](#); [Moore, Kathrin \(CPC\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(CPC\)](#); planning@rodneyfong.com; [Rich Hillis](#)
Cc: [Feliciano, Josephine \(CPC\)](#)
Subject: 1863 Mission
Date: Wednesday, May 16, 2018 3:51:37 PM
Attachments: [1863 Mission st Support!.msg](#)
[Letter in support of 1863 Mission Project.msg](#)

From: [Secretary, Commissions \(CPC\)](#)
To: [Feliciano, Josephine \(CPC\)](#)
Subject: FW: 1863 Mission Street (Case NO. 2009.1001DRP) - support emails
Date: Wednesday, May 16, 2018 3:50:42 PM
Attachments: [1863Mission_emails.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

-----Original Message-----

From: factory 1 design [<mailto:design@factory1.com>]
Sent: Wednesday, May 16, 2018 3:29 PM
To: Rich Hillis; Melgar, Myrna (CPC); Rodney Fong; Johnson, Milicent (CPC); Koppel, Joel (CPC); Moore, Kathrin (CPC); Richards, Dennis (CPC); Secretary, Commissions (CPC)
Cc: Ajello Hoagland, Linda (CPC); Ronen, Hillary; Beinart, Amy (BOS)
Subject: 1863 Mission Street (Case NO. 2009.1001DRP) - support emails

Dear Secretary Ionin and Planning Commissioners-

It was brought to our attention that the attached emails were sent last week but were not in the packet. We wanted to make sure they were received.

Best.
Kelly Hill
Larisa Pedroncelli
1875 Mission Street #110

From: [Secretary, Commissions \(CPC\)](#)
To: [Bintliff, Jacob \(CPC\)](#)
Cc: [Feliciano, Josephine \(CPC\)](#)
Subject: FW: 2018-004633PCA - Mayor's Process Improvements Ordinance
Date: Wednesday, May 16, 2018 3:50:33 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: Elizabeth Fromer [mailto:efromer3@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, May 16, 2018 3:34 PM
To: richhillissf@yahoo.com; Rodney Fong; Richards, Dennis (CPC); Moore, Kathrin (CPC); joel.joppel@sfgov.org; Johnson, Millicent (CPC); Melgar, Myrna (CPC)
Cc: Secretary, Commissions (CPC)
Subject: 2018-004633PCA - Mayor's Process Improvements Ordinance

President Hillis and Planning Commissioners,

I'm writing to express my alarm and concern about the proposed Process Improvements that will be presented at the Informational on May 17th.

Reducing neighborhood notification time from 30 to 20 days does not improve planning for our neighborhoods. Neither do Discretionary Review staff reductions and "reforms," or over-the-counter permits for rear yard expansions that can include up to two floors and extend 12 feet into back yards.

All of these "improvements" significantly harm the ability of residents to become adequately informed or take appropriate action about nearby projects. In short, it takes away real community control. The recent outcry over Senate Bill 827 and its attack on local planning and zoning controls is a recent reminder that neighborhood residents are not willing to accept these undemocratic actions.

The public must be heard in neighborhood projects, and engage with Planning about projects next door and policies that affect all of us citywide. Good city planning must be a two-way process. Neighborhood communities know best what projects may or may not work well to maintain good quality of life. Neighbors have a right to negotiate for better outcomes if a project next door will adversely affect them. And San Francisco residents should be able to help determine how our city changes, not just developers and speculators.

Please reconsider any changes that limit or make public engagement more difficult.

Sincerely,

Dr. Lisa Fromer
President
Liberty Hill Neighborhood Association (LHNA)
efromer3@gmail.com
415-826-5334

From: [Secretary, Commissions \(CPC\)](#)
To: [Richards, Dennis \(CPC\)](#); [Johnson, Milicent \(CPC\)](#); [Koppel, Joel \(CPC\)](#); [Moore, Kathrin \(CPC\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(CPC\)](#); planning@rodnevfong.com; [Rich Hillis](#)
Cc: [Feliciano, Josephine \(CPC\)](#)
Subject: FW: Supporting 1863 Mission AS IS
Date: Wednesday, May 16, 2018 11:29:02 AM
Attachments: [Supporting 1863 Mission AS IS.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.sfpplanning.org

From: irene.florez@gmail.com [mailto:irene.florez@gmail.com] **On Behalf Of** Irene
Sent: Wednesday, May 16, 2018 11:14 AM
To: Secretary, Commissions (CPC); Ajello Hoagland, Linda (CPC)
Subject: Supporting 1863 Mission AS IS

2009.1011DRP
1863 MISSION STREET
L. HOAGLAND: (415) 575-6823

Dear Planning Commissioners,

I am writing to support the proposed project at 1863 Mission Street as is. As a Mission resident and next door neighbor to the site, I and others in the vicinity await the construction of this infill project. We have been waiting for years for the construction phase of this project to begin.

1863 Mission was last purchased on 1/27/2004 and planning for the current project began on 4/9/2003. Since then, the project has made it through several rounds of planning reviews and even passed the extended review required by the Mission Interim Control.

1863 Mission is only 350 ft away from Marshall Elementary. Because the site is an empty lot, currently holding large machinery and building materials, it is trash and crime magnet.

Daily children attending Marshall Elementary are greeted with needles, glass, and other trash strewn around both the front and back of this empty lot. On Saturdays and Sundays, the front of the lot becomes the site of an illegal bazaar where vendors set up clothes, shampoo bottles and other decoy items of relatively low value which hide the drugs and weapons that they traffic on bazaar days. On bazaar days, neighbors stay indoors and shades are drawn as the front and back of the 1863 lot become a prime location for heavy intravenous drug use. This is particularly difficult for our neighborhood, where the majority of children under 6 stay at home (source: <https://statisticalatlas.com/tract/California/San-Francisco-County/020100/School-Enrollment>)

As a local resident with a young child, I ask you to help us by approving this project and letting construction begin once and for all. We know that increased foot traffic will reduce illegal activity at our doorstep and around Marshall Elementary.

Awaiting your decision to increase safety in our neighborhood,
Irene Florez
1875 Mission Resident

||

└────────┘

From: [Ionin, Jonas \(CPC\)](#)
To: [Richards, Dennis \(CPC\)](#); [Johnson, Milicent \(CPC\)](#); [Koppel, Joel \(CPC\)](#); [Moore, Kathrin \(CPC\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(CPC\)](#); planning@rodneyfong.com; [Rich Hillis](#)
Cc: [Feliciano, Josephine \(CPC\)](#)
Subject: FW: Process Improvement Report
Date: Wednesday, May 16, 2018 10:58:46 AM
Attachments: [Notificatin Process.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: Bintliff, Jacob (CPC)
Sent: Wednesday, May 16, 2018 10:48 AM
To: Ionin, Jonas (CPC)
Subject: FW: Process Improvement Report

Hi Jonas – here is the public comment received for CPC 5/17 hearing. Thank you!

Jacob Bintliff, MCP
Senior Planner

San Francisco Planning Department
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400 San Francisco, CA 94103
Direct: 415.575.9170 | www.sfplanning.org
[San Francisco Property Information Map](#)

From: Thomas Schuttish [<mailto:schuttishtr@sbcglobal.net>]
Sent: Tuesday, May 15, 2018 4:56 PM
To: Bintliff, Jacob (CPC)
Subject: Process Improvement Report

Dear Mr. Bintliff:
Good afternoon.
Attached below are my comments to the Commission on this matter.
I may have further comments that I will submit in writing at the hearing.
Thank you and have a nice evening.
Sincerely,
Georgia Schuttish

From: [Ionin, Jonas \(CPC\)](#)
To: [Richards, Dennis \(CPC\)](#); [Johnson, Milicent \(CPC\)](#); [Koppel, Joel \(CPC\)](#); [Moore, Kathrin \(CPC\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(CPC\)](#); [planning@rodneyfong.com](#); [Rich Hillis](#); [Aaron Jon Hyland - HPC](#); [Andrew Wolfram \(andrew@tefarch.com\)](#); [Black, Kate \(CPC\)](#); [Diane Matsuda](#); [Ellen Johnck - HPC](#); [Jonathan Pearlman](#); [Richard S. E. Johns](#)
Cc: [Feliciano, Josephine \(CPC\)](#)
Subject: FW: *** STATEMENT *** MAYOR MARK FARRELL ON THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS REJECTION OF POLICE COMMISSION REAPPOINTMENTS
Date: Wednesday, May 16, 2018 10:24:21 AM
Attachments: [5.15.18 Police Commission Reappointments.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: Tuesday, May 15, 2018 5:17 PM
To: MayorsPressOffice, MYR (MYR)
Subject: *** STATEMENT *** MAYOR MARK FARRELL ON THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS REJECTION OF POLICE COMMISSION REAPPOINTMENTS

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE:

Tuesday, May 15, 2018

Contact: Mayor's Office of Communications, 415-554-6131

***** STATEMENT *****
**MAYOR MARK FARRELL ON THE BOARD OF
SUPERVISORS REJECTION OF POLICE COMMISSION
REAPPOINTMENTS**

"I am extremely disappointed that the Board of Supervisors decided to politicize the appointment process of the Police Commission at such a crucial time in our city. Rejecting the reappointments of Joe Marshall, an African American leader and longtime anti-violence pioneer, and Sonia Melara, a Latina woman and chief advocate of police reform, is outrageous.

Without these appointments, the Police Commission lacks quorum and cannot meet. Citizen oversight of the Police Department is not occurring. We will not have a full commission until September, due to the politicization of these nominees.

Most importantly, in rejecting Commissioners Melara and Marshall, the Board has halted the critical work of overseeing implementation of police reforms. This includes institutionalizing our new use-of-force policies, training for Tasers, partnerships with the California Department of Justice and officer discipline cases."

From: [Ionin, Jonas \(CPC\)](#)
To: [Dennis Hong](#); [Secretary, Commissions \(CPC\)](#); [Richards, Dennis \(CPC\)](#); [Johnson, Millicent \(CPC\)](#); [Koppel, Joel \(CPC\)](#); [Moore, Kathrin \(CPC\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(CPC\)](#); [planning@rodneyfong.com](#); [Rich Hillis](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [Kim, Jane \(BOS\)](#); [Gibson, Lisa \(CPC\)](#); [Rahaim, John \(CPC\)](#); [Vu, Doug \(CPC\)](#); [MayorMarkFarrell \(MYR\)](#); [Feliciano, Josephine \(CPC\)](#)
Subject: RE: 430 Main Street case number 2014-002033DX
Date: Wednesday, May 16, 2018 9:15:13 AM

Mr. Hong,

Please be advised that this item is scheduled for May 24th. Your correspondence has been transmitted to the Commissioners.

*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: Dennis Hong [mailto:dennisj.gov88@yahoo.com]
Sent: Wednesday, May 16, 2018 8:30 AM
To: Secretary, Commissions (CPC)
Cc: Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Gibson, Lisa (CPC); Rahaim, John (CPC); Vu, Doug (CPC); MayorMarkFarrell (MYR); Ionin, Jonas (CPC)
Subject: 430 Main Street case number 2014-002033DX

Good morning Honorable Members of the Planning Commission.

I understand that this 430 Main Street (Case# 2014-002033DX) project would be coming up at this weeks 5/17/2018 meeting. I did not see it on the agenda, but if not either way when it does come up, please use this as my full support for the 430 Main / 429 Beal Street Project. I'm sorry I will be unable to attend this weeks meeting.

Over the past few years I have watched the development of this Project. As I see it both the Planning Department (Mr. Doug Vu, Planner), the developer and the community have worked very hard. Per the latest

revisions /presentation it shows it has included most of the key community issues.

Please, lets not let this one get away! We have already lost the One Oak (due to construction costs) and several others in the Mission district. It is the developers/sponsors like this that help with our housing crisis, office space, etc.. The city can't do it. Many of the developers are moving away from or City and that's sad. Several have already moved to Oakland and South San Francisco.

I have had a limited chance to review this DEIR on line and at several Planning Commission Meetings and was asked if I would chime in on this. The developer and the Planning department has done an excellent job in meeting the communities requests. As of right now this is a real blighted parcel and it shows how such a wonderful building design can bloom from this site.

My name is Dennis Hong, a retired professional construction project manager, a San Francisco Resident and home owner for 70+ years, living in District 7. I know of this area all to well, this would be a great opportunity to see this project rise on this parcel.

So, with all that said, again as I understand it this will soon come to you for approval/certification and I would like your support. Time is ticking and the cost of construction keeps going up, not down.

If anyone has any questions to my email, please get back to me. In closing, I look forward to everyone's approval/s.

Best, Dennis

From: [Ionin, Jonas \(CPC\)](#)
To: [Richards, Dennis \(CPC\)](#); [Johnson, Millicent \(CPC\)](#); [Koppel, Joel \(CPC\)](#); [Moore, Kathrin \(CPC\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(CPC\)](#); planning@rodneyfong.com; [Rich Hillis](#)
Cc: [Feliciano, Josephine \(CPC\)](#)
Subject: FW: Letter to PC Requesting Continuance - 792 Capp St (34981.2)
Date: Tuesday, May 15, 2018 3:15:38 PM
Attachments: [LTO Planning Commission re Continuance \(792 Capp St\).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: Brett Gladstone [mailto:BGladstone@hansonbridgett.com]
Sent: Tuesday, May 15, 2018 3:06 PM
To: Ionin, Jonas (CPC)
Cc: Rich Hillis (rich@fortmason.org)
Subject: FW: Letter to PC Requesting Continuance - 792 Capp St (34981.2)

Jonas. Please note request for continuance. Would you please send to Commissioners before the hearing? Please let me know if that is not possible.

Also, please let me know if your records show if there will be a full Commission in two weeks, as we would not want to postpone again for the same reason we are requesting continuance today.

Thank you.

From: [Secretary, Commissions \(CPC\)](#)
To: [Christensen, Michael \(CPC\)](#)
Cc: [Feliciano, Josephine \(CPC\)](#)
Subject: FW: 792 Capp St. (2016-001283CUA)
Date: Tuesday, May 15, 2018 2:00:31 PM
Attachments: [729 Capp St - Second Hearing \(1\).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

-----Original Message-----

From: Victoria Fierce [<mailto:victoria@carlaef.org>]
Sent: Tuesday, May 15, 2018 1:01 PM
To: christensen@sfgov.org; Moore, Kathrin (CPC); Melgar, Myrna (CPC); Koppel, Joel (CPC); planning@rodneymong.com; Richards, Dennis (CPC); richhillissf@gmail.com; Johnson, Milicent (CPC)
Cc: info@sfcityattorney.org; Secretary, Commissions (CPC)
Subject: 792 Capp St. (2016-001283CUA)

Honorable members of the San Francisco Planning Commission:

The California Renters Legal Advocacy and Education Fund submits the attached letter in regards to this Thursday's hearing on 792 Capp St, Case No. 2016-001283CUA.

From: [Secretary, Commissions \(CPC\)](#)
To: [Feliciano, Josephine \(CPC\)](#)
Subject: FW: 1863 Mission Street (Case NO. 2009.1001DRP) - full statement by DR requestors
Date: Tuesday, May 15, 2018 1:57:17 PM
Attachments: [1863Mission_DRstatement.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

-----Original Message-----

From: factory 1 design [<mailto:design@factory1.com>]
Sent: Tuesday, May 15, 2018 12:25 PM
To: Rich Hillis; Melgar, Myrna (CPC); Rodney Fong; Johnson, Milicent (CPC); Koppel, Joel (CPC); Moore, Kathrin (CPC); Richards, Dennis (CPC); Secretary, Commissions (CPC)
Cc: Ajello Hoagland, Linda (CPC); Ronen, Hillary; Beinart, Amy (BOS); Rahaim, John (CPC); Sucre, Richard (CPC)
Subject: 1863 Mission Street (Case NO. 2009.1001DRP) - full statement by DR requestors

Dear Planning Commissioners -

Please find our attached full DR statement ahead of our hearing this Thursday, May 17.

Yours respectfully,

Kelly Hill
Larisa Pedroncelli
1875 Mission Street #110

From: [Ionin, Jonas \(CPC\)](#)
To: [Richards, Dennis \(CPC\)](#); [Johnson, Millicent \(CPC\)](#); [Koppel, Joel \(CPC\)](#); [Moore, Kathrin \(CPC\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(CPC\)](#); planning@rodneyfong.com; [Rich Hillis](#)
Cc: [Feliciano, Josephine \(CPC\)](#)
Subject: FW: Letter to Clerk of the Board, Planning Commission re Central SoMa General Plan Amendments ordinance
Date: Tuesday, May 15, 2018 1:55:58 PM
Attachments: [2018-05-15 Letter to Clerk and Commission re Central SoMa General Plan amendments Ordinance.pdf](#)
[2018-05-15 Central SoMa General Plan amendments Ordinance.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: Miljanich, Peter (CAT) [mailto:Peter.Miljanich@sfcityatty.org]
Sent: Tuesday, May 15, 2018 12:44 PM
To: Ionin, Jonas (CPC)
Cc: WONG, VICTORIA (CAT); Wertheim, Steve (CPC); Switzky, Joshua (CPC); Chen, Lisa (CPC)
Subject: Letter to Clerk of the Board, Planning Commission re Central SoMa General Plan Amendments ordinance

Jonas:

At the direction of Planning Department staff, I emailed the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors the attached letter regarding clerical corrections to the Central SoMa General Plan Amendments ordinance. Please distribute this letter and the attached ordinance to the Commission members.

If you have any questions, please let me know. Thank you,

Peter

Peter R. Miljanich
Deputy City Attorney
City Hall Room 375
San Francisco, CA 94102
Tel: 415-554-4620
email: Peter.Miljanich@sfcityatty.org

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This e-mail message, including any attachments, is intended for the sole use of the person(s) shown as recipient(s) and may contain confidential and privileged information. This transmittal should not be reviewed by, used by, retained by, or disclosed to any unauthorized person. If you are not an intended recipient, please contact the sender by return e-mail and destroy all copies of the original message. Thank you.

From: [Horn, Jeffrey \(CPC\)](#)
To: [CTYPLN - COMMISSION SECRETARY](#)
Cc: [Washington, Delvin \(CPC\)](#)
Subject: FW: Request for Continuance - May 24, 2018 - Planning Commission Hearing - 655 Alvarado St.
Date: Tuesday, May 15, 2018 12:51:19 PM
Attachments: [Request for Continuance - May 24 2018- Planning Commission Hearing -655 Alvarado St..msg](#)

Hi Jonas,

Please see request below and attached,

Thanks

Jeff Horn, Senior Planner
Southwest Team, Current Planning Division
San Francisco Planning Department
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, CA 94103
Direct: 415-575-6925 | **Email:** jeffrey.horn@sfgov.org
www.sfplanning.org | [San Francisco Property Information Map](#)

From: Mary Ferretti-breidinger [mailto:mferrettisf@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, May 15, 2018 12:44 PM
To: richhillissf@gmail.com
Cc: Horn, Jeffrey (CPC); HC Thai
Subject: Request for Continuance - May 24, 2018 - Planning Commission Hearing - 655 Alvarado St.

Dear Commission President Hillis,

I understand Commissioner Richards is out next week and will not be available for the May 24, 2018 Planning Commission Hearing regarding 655 Alvarado St. I am the adjacent owner, at 651 Alvarado St., with a damaged building. This hearing is very important to me. I would like all the Commissioners to be present at the Hearing to present my case. Commissioner Richards stated at the February 22, 2018 Planning Hearing that he was waiting to hear from the Building Department before he could cast his vote. The BIC Hearing is tomorrow. I am requesting the Planning Commission Hearing for 655 Alvarado St., set on Calendar for May 24, 2018, be "continued" until all commissioners can be present. I can also be present to request in person.

Thank you. I appreciate your time to this matter.

Sincerely,

Mary Ferretti-Breidinger

cc: Jeff Horn - Planning Department

Myra Thai - owner - 661-663 Alvarado St

From: [Ionin, Jonas \(CPC\)](#)
To: [Richards, Dennis \(CPC\)](#); [Johnson, Milicent \(CPC\)](#); [Koppel, Joel \(CPC\)](#); [Moore, Kathrin \(CPC\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(CPC\)](#); [planning@rodneyfong.com](#); [Rich Hillis](#); [Aaron Jon Hyland - HPC](#); [Andrew Wolfram \(andrew@tefarch.com\)](#); [Black, Kate \(CPC\)](#); [Diane Matsuda](#); [Ellen Johnck - HPC](#); [Jonathan Pearlman](#); [Richard S. E. Johns](#)
Cc: [Feliciano, Josephine \(CPC\)](#)
Subject: FW: *** PRESS RELEASE *** MAYOR MARK FARRELL ANNOUNCES STRATEGIC PLAN TO ADD 250 SWORN PERSONNEL TO THE SAN FRANCISCO POLICE DEPARTMENT
Date: Tuesday, May 15, 2018 11:24:21 AM
Attachments: [5.15.18 Public Safety Investments.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: Tuesday, May 15, 2018 11:07 AM
To: MayorsPressOffice, MYR (MYR)
Subject: *** PRESS RELEASE *** MAYOR MARK FARRELL ANNOUNCES STRATEGIC PLAN TO ADD 250 SWORN PERSONNEL TO THE SAN FRANCISCO POLICE DEPARTMENT

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE:

Tuesday, May 15, 2018

Contact: Mayor's Office of Communications, 415-554-6131

***** PRESS RELEASE *****

**MAYOR MARK FARRELL ANNOUNCES STRATEGIC PLAN
TO ADD 250 SWORN PERSONNEL TO THE
SAN FRANCISCO POLICE DEPARTMENT**

Mayor's two-year budget proposal features \$34.2 million in additional public safety investments, including funding support for hiring plan, new equipment, vehicles and ongoing police reforms

San Francisco, CA— Mayor Mark Farrell today announced \$34.2 million in new public safety investments, including a strategic plan to add 250 more sworn personnel to the police department over the next four years and additional funding for new vehicles, equipment and reform efforts.

As part of Mayor Farrell's hiring plan, 130 new officers will enter the police academy in the next fiscal year, establishing the foundation of a four-year strategic hiring plan that will result in 250 new members.

"Public safety has always been my top priority as Mayor—I am following through on my commitment to add additional officers to neighborhoods across San Francisco," said Mayor Farrell. "The men and women of the San Francisco Police Department are some of the finest

officers in the country—we just need more of them. This budget proposal will provide our police department with the resources they need to succeed while we work with our communities to ensure a collaborative, cooperative approach to public safety.”

The budget also includes \$7.5 million for 130 new police vehicles, \$1.7 million for police reform measures and community engagement initiatives and \$3 million for Controlled Electrical Devices, less-lethal safety options commonly referred to as Tasers.

The strategic hiring plan will provide increased opportunities for promotions at the San Francisco Police Department (SFPD), including 20 sergeant and two lieutenant positions that will be added to the command roster. The plan includes funding for additional civilian analytical expertise and provides resources to shift highly trained civilians into some positions held by sworn personnel, enabling the department to redeploy the sworn members.

The new hires will bolster existing public safety improvement efforts championed by Mayor Farrell and Police Chief William Scott. Those enhancements include increasing the citywide foot patrol plan, adding investigation teams at stations to allow for seven-day staffing, and expanding the burglary and serial crime units.

In addition, the new hires will support the Healthy Streets Operation Center, an interagency response to homelessness, behavioral health issues and drug use incidents on city streets, along with measures to provide coordinated care for frequent users of the City’s mental health services.

“This commitment from Mayor Farrell will enable and empower the hardworking men and women of the San Francisco Police Department to better address the evolving public safety needs of our City,” said Chief William Scott. “By providing for the additional deployment of 250 sworn members, funding for much-needed equipment and other crime reduction efforts, we can continue to meet the challenges facing San Francisco and advance our mission of providing safety with respect for all in our City.”

In addition to bolstering the size of the department, Mayor Farrell’s budget support efforts of the SFPD’s ongoing police reforms. In 2016, the SFPD entered into a voluntary agreement with the United States Department of Justice to carry out 272 reform measures, many related to use-of-force operations. The SFPD is now collaborating with the California Department of Justice to finish implementing all the reforms.

“For decades, the SFPD has been understaffed, leaving them without the ability to combat crime and the related social issues due to the lack of personnel and the need for the current officers to respond to calls for service,” said Police Commission President Thomas Mazzucco. “Strategic and fair policing require highly trained officers with the necessary equipment to address the issues impacting our city and making our streets safe for our residents and visitors.”

“Today’s announcement by Mayor Farrell is a positive commitment to public safety in San Francisco,” said Supervisor Catherine Stefani. “For too long our Police Department has been understaffed and underfunded. This commitment will provide more patrols on our streets, help address the property crime epidemic and make our neighborhoods safer.”

“I applaud Mayor Farrell’s initiative to fully staff our police force,” said Supervisor Jeff

Sheehy. “When I came on the Board last year I recognized that we were understaffed and I was the only member of the Budget Committee to ask for an increase. These additional officers will enable us to turn the corner on property crime and make all of our residents safer.”

From: [Ionin, Jonas \(CPC\)](#)
To: [Richards, Dennis \(CPC\)](#); [Johnson, Milicent \(CPC\)](#); [Koppel, Joel \(CPC\)](#); [Moore, Kathrin \(CPC\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(CPC\)](#); planning@rodneyfong.com; [Rich Hillis](#)
Cc: [Christensen, Michael \(CPC\)](#); [Feliciano, Josephine \(CPC\)](#)
Subject: Capp
Date: Tuesday, May 15, 2018 9:10:48 AM
Attachments: [Public Comment for Planning Commission Meeting on May 17.msg](#)
[Support for proposed development on 792 Capp.msg](#)
[Fwd 792 Capp Street.msg](#)
[Re 792 Capp St..msg](#)

From: [Secretary, Commissions \(CPC\)](#)
To: [Richards, Dennis \(CPC\)](#); [Johnson, Milicent \(CPC\)](#); [Koppel, Joel \(CPC\)](#); [Moore, Kathrin \(CPC\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(CPC\)](#); planning@rodneyfong.com; [Rich Hillis \(CPC\)](#)
Cc: [Christensen, Michael \(CPC\)](#); [Feliciano, Josephine \(CPC\)](#)
Subject: FW: 792 Capp Street
Date: Tuesday, May 15, 2018 9:10:28 AM

*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: Anjali Jameson [mailto:anjali.jameson@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, May 15, 2018 8:50 AM
To: Secretary, Commissions (CPC)
Cc: Christensen, Michael (CPC)
Subject: 792 Capp Street

To the Planning Commission,

I am unable to attend the hearing on Thursday, May 17th (item #15), but I would like to express my strong support for the development of a four unit building at 792 Capp Street.

The home is currently vacant, is not historic, there have been no evictions, was not rent controlled, and is one block from the Mission public transit corridor.

If we don't start building homes and making it easier for upstanding, thoughtful San Franciscans like Lucas Eastwood to develop housing in the Mission, we will simply continue to have a housing shortage.

There is absolutely no reason this man should not be able to build 4 housing units in the Mission to contribute to an increase in places for people to live in this beautiful neighborhood.

I ask you to approve this project.

Thank you,
Anjali

661 Shotwell Street
SF, CA 94110

--

Anjali Jameson
1.415.265.8966 (m)

anjali.jameson (skype)

From: [Ionin, Jonas \(CPC\)](#)
To: [Richards, Dennis \(CPC\)](#); [Johnson, Milicent \(CPC\)](#); [Koppel, Joel \(CPC\)](#); [Moore, Kathrin \(CPC\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(CPC\)](#); planning@rodneyfong.com; [Rich Hillis](#)
Cc: [Feliciano, Josephine \(CPC\)](#)
Subject: FW: Regarding Lombardi's, 1600 Jackson St. building
Date: Monday, May 14, 2018 2:50:53 PM
Attachments: [Whole Foods 365 Lombardi's.docx](#)

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

-----Original Message-----

From: Foster, Nicholas (CPC)
Sent: Monday, May 14, 2018 11:59 AM
To: Ionin, Jonas (CPC)
Cc: Watty, Elizabeth (CPC)
Subject: FW: Regarding Lombardi's, 1600 Jackson St. building

Hi Jonas:

The (attached) letter (also in the body of the email located below) is addressed to the Planning Commission but was sent to the PIC general email with numerous staff listed in the cc: field.

I've responded to a number of post-hearing emails/calls directed to the Department regarding this project, but in this case, how shall we respond? Or, shall we forward this along to the Planning Commission given it was directed to the Planning Commission?

Thanks,

Nicholas Foster, AICP, LEED GA
Senior Planner, Northeast Team, Current Planning Division San Francisco Planning Department
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400 San Francisco, CA 94103
Direct: 415.575.9167 | www.sfplanning.org San Francisco Property Information Map

-----Original Message-----

From: PIC, PLN (CPC)
Sent: Monday, May 14, 2018 6:32 AM
To: Foster, Nicholas (CPC); Schuett, Rachel (CPC)
Subject: Fw: Regarding Lombardi's, 1600 Jackson St. building

fyi
>JB

Property Information Map (PIM): <http://propertymap.sfplanning.org><<http://propertymap.sfplanning.org/>>

The information provided in this correspondence is based on a preliminary review of information provided by the requestor. It does not constitute a comprehensive review of the project or request. For a more extensive review it is strongly recommended to schedule a project review meeting. The information provided in this email does not constitute a Zoning Administrator letter of determination. To receive a letter of determination you must submit a formal request directly to the Zoning Administrator. For complaints, please contact the Code Enforcement Division.

From: Camille Cusumano <ocaramia@me.com>

Sent: Friday, May 11, 2018 3:15 PM

To: PIC, PLN (CPC)

Cc: Joslin, Jeff (CPC); Priego, Nora (CPC); Watty, Elizabeth (CPC); Luellen, Mark (CPC); Lindsay, David (CPC); District Attorney, (DAT); hknights@sfchronicle.com

Subject: Regarding Lombardi's, 1600 Jackson St. building

My letter is attached and pasted in .

San Francisco Planning Commission
1660 Mission Street
San Francisco, CA 94103

May 10, 2018

Dear Planning Commission:

I'm writing to you regarding the ever-in-limbo 1600 Jackson Street, formerly Lombardi's. I have listened carefully to arguments and as a resident living paces from Lombardi's, I want Whole Foods 365 to go into that property already zoned for that business.

I want WF 365, not because it would serve me, but because, after meeting with my neighbors, I agree it would serve the majority of people who live in this area. I live at 1650 Jackson St. where I have owned my studio condo since 2005 and lived in it since 2012.

I cannot believe that the commissioners would even allow the Lombardi's building to be torn down. That action is almost criminal, a waste of a structure that is already zoned and suited for a purpose that the people who live right here want.

My burning question to you is—pardon my ignorance—is not a city commissioner supposed to back its constituents. I'm referring to the people who live in a neighborhood like mine and know what it's like day in, day out? We have expressly conveyed our needs with solid reasons so why are we ignored? Can you explain the backroom politics?

I was not readily in support of Whole Foods when I first heard the option. But I listened to my neighbors who had done their homework and told me the pros and cons. I wish the commissioners could have been as astute rather than spouting egregious and petty "PC" blather such as opposing the project because they dislike Amazon. Really, now, is that fair to us? To cut off our noses to spite another's face?

I do understand the opposition to Amazon (and the other big tech companies that have altered the face of my city). I've lived in San Francisco since 1973 when materialism was not so rampant. However, I have survived here because I have negotiated with the reality of the changing world. Perhaps Whole Foods 365 is a compromise, too. But it is not a knee-jerk reaction like that of the commissioners. Another long-time SF resident, a retired History professor, recently said to me, "I don't understand city government, I guess it's all bad."

Let me ask another question. Where were these commissioners when the nearly half-dozen drug dealers, excuse me, stores—Walgreens, CVS, Rite-Aid, moved in all around my neighborhood? Did we really need that many of these pharma giants? I get my holistic medicine from places like Whole Foods 365—I'm 67 and going strong, so it must

be working. WF 365 is comparable to Trader Joe prices, so I can afford their quality goods.

Where were you and these commissioners when the Academy of Art (that tax dodger, have they paid up yet?) moved into my neighborhood, taking up at least three, maybe more buildings on Van Ness for show, for museum cars that are useless to us on fixed incomes—or even on normal incomes, or to homeless people. And I have received notice, with fuzzy, opaque details, that the Academy is planning to gobble up more real estate near me. Say it ain't so.

I am disappointed in Aaron Peskin who lives in North Beach and has the temerity to oppose what we in my neighborhood overwhelmingly want.

We need low-income and affordable housing in the city in places that are much less dense than this middle Polk area. What a nightmare it would be for us, first to have that perfectly good structure destroyed, then to add more high-income residents, cars, and traffic jams.

I'd like a response to my letter.

Sincerely,

Camille Cusumano

CC:

SF District Attorney George Gascón

City Commissioners – by email

Jackson Street Homeowners Association (email) Heather Knight, San Francisco Chronicle (email)

Jeff Joslin jeff.joslin@sfgov.org<<mailto:jeff.joslin@sfgov.org>>

Nora Priego nora.priego@sfgov.org<<mailto:nora.priego@sfgov.org>>

Elizabeth Watty elizabeth.watty@sfgov.org<<mailto:elizabeth.watty@sfgov.org>>

Mark Luella mark.luellen@sfgov.org<<mailto:mark.luellen@sfgov.org>>

David Lindsay - david.lindsay@sfgov.org<<mailto:david.lindsay@sfgov.org>>

George Gascon - districtattorney@sfgov.org<<mailto:districtattorney@sfgov.org>>

From: [Ionin, Jonas \(CPC\)](#)
To: [Richards, Dennis \(CPC\)](#); [Johnson, Milicent \(CPC\)](#); [Koppel, Joel \(CPC\)](#); [Moore, Kathrin \(CPC\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(CPC\)](#); [planning@rodneyfong.com](#); [Rich Hillis](#); [Aaron Jon Hyland - HPC](#); [Andrew Wolfram \(andrew@tefarch.com\)](#); [Black, Kate \(CPC\)](#); [Diane Matsuda](#); [Ellen Johnck - HPC](#); [Jonathan Pearlman](#); [Richard S. E. Johns](#)
Cc: [Feliciano, Josephine \(CPC\)](#)
Subject: FW: Reintroduction of Mayor's Process Improvements Ordinance
Date: Monday, May 14, 2018 2:12:50 PM

FYI

*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: Bintliff, Jacob (CPC)
Sent: Monday, May 14, 2018 11:40 AM
To: Ionin, Jonas (CPC)
Cc: Conner, Kate (CPC); Sider, Dan (CPC); Rahaim, John (CPC)
Subject: Reintroduction of Mayor's Process Improvements Ordinance

Hi Jonas,

We'd like to make both the HPC and CPC Commissioners aware of some minor changes to the Mayor's Process Improvements Ordinance that both Commissions are scheduled to hear this week.

The Mayor will be reintroducing the legislation at the Board of Supervisors hearing this Tuesday, so the ordinance will be updated from the version provided to Commissioners in their hearing packets last week. Planning will publish a memorandum discussing these minor changes late Tuesday or Wednesday morning, as soon as the Ordinance has been reintroduced. The changes are substantive, but are relatively minor and achieve the same effect as the version discussed in the Commission packets provided last week. The staff recommendation will remain a recommendation for approval.

I am happy to chat with Commissioners with any questions about this, and look forward to getting the brief memo to them as soon as we can.

Thank you!

Jacob

Jacob Bintliff, MCP
Senior Planner

San Francisco Planning Department
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400 San Francisco, CA 94103
Direct: 415.575.9170 | www.sfplanning.org

[San Francisco Property Information Map](#)

From: [Ionin, Jonas \(CPC\)](#)
To: [Richards, Dennis \(CPC\)](#); [Johnson, Milicent \(CPC\)](#); [Koppel, Joel \(CPC\)](#); [Moore, Kathrin \(CPC\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(CPC\)](#); planning@rodneyfong.com; [Rich Hillis](#)
Cc: [Feliciano, Josephine \(CPC\)](#)
Subject: FW: The Avenue - 1015-1033 Van Ness Avenue
Date: Monday, May 14, 2018 2:08:08 PM
Attachments: [Complaint for Injunctive Relief.pdf](#)

FYI

*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: Choi, Jennifer (CAT) [mailto:Jennifer.Choi@sfcityatty.org]
Sent: Monday, May 14, 2018 1:25 PM
To: Ionin, Jonas (CPC); JENSEN, KRISTEN (CAT); KEITH, PETER (CAT); NAGAYAMA, KEITH (CAT)
Subject: The Avenue - 1015-1033 Van Ness Avenue

Jonas,

Attached please find a copy of the lawsuit filed by the City and County of San Francisco against the owners of the Avenue. Please distribute copies to members of the Planning Commission ahead of Thursday's hearing. Thank you.

Jennifer E. Choi
Deputy City Attorney
Office of the City Attorney
1390 Market Street, 6th Flr.
San Francisco, CA 94102
(415) 554-3887 Direct
(415) 437-4644 Facsimile
jennifer.choi@sfcityatty.org

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This communication and its contents may contain confidential and/or legally privileged information. It is solely for the use of the intended recipient(s). Unauthorized interception, review, use or disclosure is prohibited and may violate applicable laws, including the Electronic Communications Privacy Act. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender and destroy all copies of the communication.

From: Ionin, Jonas (CPC) <jonas.ionin@sfgov.org>
Sent: Friday, May 11, 2018 1:17 PM
To: Jensen, Kristen (CAT) <Kristen.Jensen@sfcityatty.org>; Keith, Peter (CAT) <Peter.Keith@sfcityatty.org>; Choi, Jennifer (CAT) <Jennifer.Choi@sfcityatty.org>; Stacy, Kate (CAT) <Kate.Stacy@sfcityatty.org>; Nagayama, Keith (CAT) <Keith.Nagayama@sfcityatty.org>
Subject: RE: Closed Session Agenda Language

Kristen, et al,

Do you think this will take more than an hour? If not, we can probably start a bit later than 11:00 am.

Please advise.

Thanks,

*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: Jensen, Kristen (CAT) [<mailto:Kristen.Jensen@sfcityattty.org>]
Sent: Friday, May 11, 2018 12:58 PM
To: Ionin, Jonas (CPC); KEITH, PETER (CAT); CHOI, JENNIFER (CAT); STACY, KATE (CAT); NAGAYAMA, KEITH (CAT)
Subject: Closed Session Agenda Language

Jonas: The Agenda for this item should read:

Conference with Legal Counsel - Pursuant to California Government Code Section 54956.9(d) (2) and San Francisco Administrative Code Section 67.10(d)(1), the Commission will discuss with legal counsel pending litigation in *City and County of San Francisco, et al. v. Melvin Lee, et al.*, San Francisco Superior Court No. CGC-18-565184. (Jennifer Choi, Peter Keith)

Thanks.

ATTORNEY-CLIENT PRIVILEGED AND CONFIDENTIAL

Please note my new e-mail address

Kristen A. Jensen
Deputy City Attorney
Office of the City Attorney
City Hall, Room 234
San Francisco, CA 94102
Kristen.jensen@sfcityattty.org
Direct: (415) 554-4615
Fax: (415) 554-4757

This message and any attachments are solely for the intended recipient and may include privileged or confidential information. If you have received this message in error, any disclosure, copying, use or distribution of the information contained in this message and any attachments is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify the sender immediately, and permanently delete this message and any attachments.

From: [Secretary, Commissions \(CPC\)](#)
To: [Feliciano, Josephine \(CPC\)](#)
Subject: FW: SFHAC Letter of Support - 792 Capp Street
Date: Monday, May 14, 2018 11:14:07 AM
Attachments: [792 Capp Letter of Support SFHAC 5.10.2018 \(1\).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: Corey Smith [mailto:corey@sfhac.org]
Sent: Monday, May 14, 2018 9:54 AM
To: Richards, Dennis (CPC); Richard Hillis; planning@rodneymfong.com; Johnson, Millicent (CPC); mooreurban@aol.com; Melgar, Myrna (CPC); Koppel, Joel (CPC)
Cc: Christensen, Michael (CPC); Sucre, Richard (CPC); Secretary, Commissions (CPC); Rahaim, John (CPC); Lucas Eastwood; DPH - bgladstone; Todd David
Subject: SFHAC Letter of Support - 792 Capp Street

Morning all,

Please see the attached endorsement letter for the 792 Capp Street Project.

Let us know if you have questions.

Best,
Corey

--

Corey Smith
Community Organizer | San Francisco Housing Action Coalition
95 Brady Street, San Francisco, CA 94103
Office (415) 541-9001 | Cell (925) 360-5290
Email: corey@sfhac.org | Web: sfhac.org

| | |
SFHAC advocates for the creation of more housing, at all levels of affordability, for Bay Area residents, present and future. [Check us out.](#)

From: [Ionin, Jonas \(CPC\)](#)
To: [Richards, Dennis \(CPC\)](#); [Johnson, Milicent \(CPC\)](#); [Koppel, Joel \(CPC\)](#); [Moore, Kathrin \(CPC\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(CPC\)](#); [planning@rodneyfong.com](#); [Rich Hillis](#); [Aaron Jon Hyland - HPC](#); [Andrew Wolfram \(andrew@tefarch.com\)](#); [Black, Kate \(CPC\)](#); [Diane Matsuda](#); [Ellen Johnck - HPC](#); [Jonathan Pearlman](#); [Richard S. E. Johns](#)
Cc: [Feliciano, Josephine \(CPC\)](#)
Subject: FW: Commission Update for the Week of May 14, 2018
Date: Monday, May 14, 2018 10:19:33 AM
Attachments: [Commission Weekly Update 5.14.18.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, May 14, 2018 10:00 AM
To: Tsang, Francis
Subject: Commission Update for the Week of May 14, 2018

Good morning.

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.

Francis

Francis Tsang

Deputy Chief of Staff
Office of Mayor Mark Farrell
City and County of San Francisco
415.554.6467 | francis.tsang@sfgov.org

From: [Ionin, Jonas \(CPC\)](#)
To: [Richards, Dennis \(CPC\)](#); [Johnson, Milicent \(CPC\)](#); [Koppel, Joel \(CPC\)](#); [Moore, Kathrin \(CPC\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(CPC\)](#); [planning@rodneyfong.com](#); [Rich Hillis](#); [Aaron Jon Hyland - HPC](#); [Andrew Wolfram \(andrew@tefarch.com\)](#); [Black, Kate \(CPC\)](#); [Diane Matsuda](#); [Ellen Johnck - HPC](#); [Jonathan Pearlman](#); [Richard S. E. Johns](#)
Cc: [Feliciano, Josephine \(CPC\)](#)
Subject: FW: *** STATEMENT *** MAYOR MARK FARRELL ON THE PASSING OF POLICE COMMISSIONER JULIUS TURMAN
Date: Monday, May 14, 2018 9:06:30 AM
Attachments: [5.13.18 Passing of Julius Turman.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: Sunday, May 13, 2018 4:59 PM
To: MayorsPressOffice, MYR (MYR)
Subject: *** STATEMENT *** MAYOR MARK FARRELL ON THE PASSING OF POLICE COMMISSIONER JULIUS TURMAN

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE:

Sunday, May 13, 2018

Contact: Mayor's Office of Communications, 415-554-6131

***** STATEMENT *****
**MAYOR MARK FARRELL ON THE PASSING OF POLICE
COMMISSIONER JULIUS TURMAN**

“As a longtime member of the Police Commission, Julius Turman provided honest candor and oversight, working tirelessly to make this city safe and secure for everyone. He was a voice of leadership who helped build trust and comradery between the men and women of the police department and San Francisco residents.

Julius was a civic leader, proud defender of human rights and a fierce advocate for equality and justice. He displayed great leadership working with his fellow commissioners to ensure that critical reforms were instituted at the San Francisco Police Department. Julius always spoke forcefully, yet truly, and he gained the well-earned respect of his colleagues and peers for his clear passion and dedication to serving the people of this City.

I am profoundly saddened by his passing. My deepest sympathies and condolences are with his family and friends at this time.”

###

As a mark of respect for the memory of Julius Turman, Mayor Farrell has directed flags to be flown at half-staff on Monday from sunrise to sunset at City Hall and San Francisco Police Department buildings.

From: [Ionin, Jonas \(CPC\)](#)
To: [Richards, Dennis \(CPC\)](#); [Johnson, Milicent \(CPC\)](#); [Koppel, Joel \(CPC\)](#); [Moore, Kathrin \(CPC\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(CPC\)](#); planning@rodneyfong.com; [Rich Hillis](#); [Aaron Jon Hyland - HPC](#); [Andrew Wolfram \(andrew@tefarch.com\)](mailto:andrew@tefarch.com); [Black, Kate \(CPC\)](#); [Diane Matsuda](#); [Ellen Johnck - HPC](#); [Jonathan Pearlman](#); [Richard S. E. Johns](#)
Cc: [Feliciano, Josephine \(CPC\)](#)
Subject: FW: *** STATEMENT *** MAYOR MARK FARRELL ON GOVERNOR JERRY BROWN'S STATE BUDGET
Date: Friday, May 11, 2018 2:29:07 PM
Attachments: [5.11.18 Governor May Budget.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, May 11, 2018 2:24 PM
To: MayorsPressOffice, MYR (MYR)
Subject: *** STATEMENT *** MAYOR MARK FARRELL ON GOVERNOR JERRY BROWN'S STATE BUDGET

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE:

Friday, May 11, 2018
Contact: Mayor's Office of Communications, 415-554-6131

***** STATEMENT *****
**MAYOR MARK FARRELL GOVERNOR ON JERRY BROWN'S
STATE BUDGET**

"Today, Governor Jerry Brown released the May Revision to the Fiscal Year 2018-19 state budget, which reflects continued revenue growth and a sizable one-time surplus. Due to the Governor's leadership and prudent fiscal decisions, the state remains in good health while increasing spending in key areas such as education and health care.

Similar to my own budgeting approach, the Governor is planning for uncertain times by continuing to invest in the State's Rainy Day Fund, positioning California for any challenges ahead. With the additional revenues announcement today, the Governor outlined several new one-time spending proposals which include infrastructure, homelessness and mental health spending.

I appreciate that the Governor is willing to propose some funding for homelessness and mental health services, however, cities and counties are battling a crisis on our streets. We need more support to address the homelessness and opioid addiction plaguing our communities. I look forward to working with the Governor, the legislature and my fellow mayors to increase these

funding levels in the weeks to come.”

###

From: [Secretary, Commissions \(CPC\)](#)
To: [Feliciano, Josephine \(CPC\)](#)
Subject: FW: SPUR Supports the Central SoMa Plan
Date: Friday, May 11, 2018 10:01:11 AM

*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: Kristy Wang [mailto:kwang@spur.org]
Sent: Thursday, May 10, 2018 4:57 PM
To: Rich Hillis; Planning@rodneymfong.com; Richards, Dennis (CPC); Johnson, Millicent (CPC); Moore, Kathrin (CPC); Melgar, Myrna (CPC); Koppel, Joel (CPC)
Cc: Secretary, Commissions (CPC); Wertheim, Steve (CPC); Switzky, Joshua (CPC); Rodgers, AnMarie (CPC); Rahaim, John (CPC); Fisher, Lisa (CPC)
Subject: SPUR Supports the Central SoMa Plan

Dear Planning Commissioners:

With the delayed start time, it looks like I will be unable to stay for the Central SoMa items today. I think I have spoken here on enough occasions for you to know that SPUR supports the Central SoMa Plan, as we have since before the Central Corridor Plan was even an official plan, but I wanted to weigh in one more time.

We encourage you to certify the EIR and recommend approval of the plan and all the associated implementing legislation and general plan amendments, etc. We're also really pleased to see the use of AB 73 to create a housing sustainability district that will help bring the housing to fruition more quickly.

This plan is really a groundbreaking plan for several reasons.

1. The plan is adding capacity for jobs in the one place in the region where people really take transit in significant numbers.
2. The plan is adding much-needed housing capacity at a time when it has become more commonly understood that we have a housing shortage. Dense, transit-oriented infill housing is appropriate in a place like Central SoMa, and this plan provides significant opportunity for more housing at all income levels to be built.
3. This plan carefully considers how to retain and enhance the things we like about SoMa — the mix of uses and some of the funkiness that comes with that — and transform the things we don't — like the dangerous streetscapes for people who are walking and biking in this neighborhood.
4. Once implemented the plan will create an unprecedented amount of community benefits. SPUR has certainly been a cautionary voice in favor of financial feasibility and moderation but if/when projects are able to move forward, this plan will enable extraordinary things to occur in this neighborhood that will make it a better place for

all.

5. Over the time that this plan has been underway, sustainability has been integrated throughout the plan for the neighborhood in a way that has not been done before, including new development with 100% GHG free electricity and envisioning a neighborhood that is greener and cleaner for everyone who lives, works and visits here.

We appreciate that the plan looks both at what Central SoMa needs as a neighborhood as well as how it fits into the city and can contribute to the broader solutions San Francisco needs. This plan tries to address both the needs we have right now and the needs we see in the future — and it's therefore urgent that the plan move forward now in order to help realize some of the significant public benefits that are envisioned.

We appreciate all the work that the planning commission and city staff (particularly Steve Wertheim) have put into this plan over the years. We look forward to this plan coming to fruition...and supporting the city's next neighborhood plan!

Best,
Kristy

Kristy Wang, LEED AP
Community Planning Policy Director
SPUR • Ideas + Action for a Better City
(415) 644-4884
(415) 425-8460 m
kwang@spur.org

[SPUR](#) | [Facebook](#) | [Twitter](#) | [Join](#) | [Get Newsletters](#)

Join us this summer for the SPUR Member Parties!
[Reserve your spot today >>](#)

From: [Secretary, Commissions \(CPC\)](#)
To: [Richards, Dennis \(CPC\)](#); [Johnson, Milicent \(CPC\)](#); [Koppel, Joel \(CPC\)](#); [Moore, Kathrin \(CPC\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(CPC\)](#); planning@rodneyfong.com; [Rich Hillis \(CPC\)](#)
Cc: [Adina, Seema \(CPC\)](#); [Feliciano, Josephine \(CPC\)](#)
Subject: FW: Opposition to Philz on Polk
Date: Friday, May 11, 2018 10:01:05 AM

*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: Elena Giacomani [mailto:lanersg@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, May 10, 2018 3:53 PM
To: Secretary, Commissions (CPC)
Subject: Opposition to Philz on Polk

To the SF Planning Commission:

I am writing to oppose the proposed introduction of the Philz Coffee chain at [2230 Polk Street](#) in Russian Hill.

I have worked on Van Ness and Washington for 16 years now and strongly feel that bringing a Philz into this space on Polk will be giving too many spaces to chains rather than local independent neighborhood cafes within three blocks of this section of Polk Street.

Philz already has a spot on Van Ness and Golden Gate with additional stores within a few miles around San Francisco.

I strongly oppose Philz moving into this space and believe it will negatively effect this neighborhood.

Sincerely,

Elena Giacomani

59 Bronte Street

San Francisco, California 94110

From: [Secretary, Commissions \(CPC\)](#)
To: [Richards, Dennis \(CPC\)](#); [Johnson, Milicent \(CPC\)](#); [Koppel, Joel \(CPC\)](#); [Moore, Kathrin \(CPC\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(CPC\)](#); planning@rodneyfong.com; [Rich Hillis](#)
Cc: [Feliciano, Josephine \(CPC\)](#)
Subject: FW: Central SoMa Plan
Date: Friday, May 11, 2018 10:00:45 AM

*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: Ancel Martinez [<mailto:ancelmartinez@gmail.com>]
Sent: Thursday, May 10, 2018 3:50 PM
To: Secretary, Commissions (CPC)
Cc: Wertheim, Steve (CPC)
Subject: Central SoMa Plan

May 8 2018

Reference:
Project Name: Central SoMa Plan Implementation Program
Hearing Date: May 10, 2018
Record Number: 2011.1356EMTZU
Via Email: Commissions.Secretary@sfgov.org

To: The San Francisco San Francisco Planning Commission

As an advocate for Open Space in San Francisco, I want to insure that our Rec & Park Department has a strong voice in any decisions made under the Central SOMA Plan, including the priority order of allocation of funds as they accrue. The incredible opportunity to increase the open space and recreational opportunities in the densest and most open space deprived part of our city needs to be guided by the Department most in touch with these needs, Recreation & Parks.

The highest priority of Rec & Park is funding for the Renovation of the Gene Friend Rec Center.

I also highly support the acquisition of the open parcels at 1133 Mission Street to create a new park in the underserved Mid Market/TL, adjacent to the Central SOMA plan area, which was endorsed by Resolution by PROSAC in 2105. Available space is rare and disappearing quickly.

Lastly, please ensure that Rec & Park has input on the design and use of all proposed POPO's. Creation of these open spaces is required of developers, but to be meaningful and useful to residents, it is imperative that Rec & Park have a voice so that they are not merely created for the use of office workers, or inaccessible, as has historically been the case, rather I support the funding of full-use parks that benefit residents and visitors alike.

Sincerely yours,

Ancel Martinez
Member – At-large Appointee
Park and Recreation Open Space Advisory Committee

Cc: Staff Contact: Steve Wertheim, Principal Planner, Citywide Planning (415) 558-6612; steve.wertheim@sfgov.org

From: [Secretary, Commissions \(CPC\)](#)
To: [Richards, Dennis \(CPC\)](#); [Johnson, Millicent \(CPC\)](#); [Koppel, Joel \(CPC\)](#); [Moore, Kathrin \(CPC\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(CPC\)](#); planning@rodneyfong.com; [Rich Hillis](#)
Cc: [Wertheim, Steve \(CPC\)](#); [Feliciano, Josephine \(CPC\)](#)
Subject: FW: In Support of Central SoMa Plan
Date: Friday, May 11, 2018 10:00:34 AM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

*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: Zahra Kelly [<mailto:zahra@natureinthecity.org>]
Sent: Thursday, May 10, 2018 11:53 AM
To: Secretary, Commissions (CPC); milcent.johnson@sfgov.org; richhillissf@sfgov.org
Subject: In Support of Central SoMa Plan



www.natureinthecity.org
info@natureinthecity.org
(415) 564-4107
PO Box 170088
San Francisco, CA 94117

Dear Commissioners -

We at Nature in the City (NTC) are very excited to see Central SoMa Plan being considered for adoption today. Our organization supports and works on many initiatives around sustainable development, open space preservation and restoration, and restoration of wild lands of San Francisco.

We at NTC are impressed with the planning of Central SoMa towards realizing a sustainable and resilient neighborhood. The SoMa plan seeks 100% GHG-Free electricity and 50% green roofs which can be up to 160' tall and provide habitat

for local species, reduce heat island effect in Central SoMa, and sequester carbon. The plan pushes neighborhood greening and seeks to support biodiversity in our city with its selection of plants.

Given how little natural habitat or greening exists in Central SoMa, this plan before you maximizes the quantity and quality of greening in both public spaces and private property. The SoMa plan will create “living” building and green corridor to create opportunity for people to connect to nature in a dense urban area.

We at NTC strongly endorse the Central SoMa Plan and hope you will too.

Sincerely,

Zahra Kelly, Project and Advocacy Manger at NTC

Nature in the City: Inspiring San Francisco to discover local nature
PO Box 170088, San Francisco, CA 94117
natureinthecity.org
415-564-4107

Nature in the City is San Francisco's first organization wholly dedicated to eco-literacy, restoration and stewardship of the city's wild places. Our highly collaborative, neighborhood-based projects include: Adah's Stairway, Backyard Natives Network, Green Hairstreak Corridor, Save Palou Phelps and Tigers on Market Street.

Give@ <http://earthisland.org/NitC/donate>

From: [Ionin, Jonas \(CPC\)](#)
To: [Feliciano, Josephine \(CPC\)](#)
Subject: FW: CSOMA comments
Date: Friday, May 11, 2018 9:08:24 AM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[image002.png](#)
[image003.png](#)
[LTR - Hillis re CSoMa amendments 5-10-2018.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: John Kevlin [mailto:jkevin@reubenlaw.com]
Sent: Thursday, May 10, 2018 1:14 PM
To: Wertheim, Steve (CPC); Ionin, Jonas (CPC)
Subject: CSOMA comments

Hey guys –

I know the hearing has already started but wanted to make sure the attached made it on the public record. I'll also be bringing copies and speaking at the hearing this afternoon.

John

REUBEN, JUNIUS & ROSE, LLP

John Kevlin, Partner
T. (415) 567-9000
F. (415) 399-9480
jkevin@reubenlaw.com
www.reubenlaw.com

SF Office:	Oakland Office:
One Bush Street, Suite 600 San Francisco, CA 94104	827 Broadway, Suite 205 Oakland, CA 94607



PRIVILEGE AND CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE – This transmittal is intended solely for use by its addressee, and may contain confidential or legally privileged information. If you receive this transmittal in error, please email a reply to the sender and delete the transmittal and any attachments.



NORTHERN CALIFORNIA
CARPENTERS
REGIONAL COUNCIL

RECEIVED

MAY 15 2018

CITY & COUNTY OF S.F.
PLANNING DEPARTMENT
CPC/HPC

May 10, 2018

Jonas Ionin
Commission Secretary
San Francisco Planning Commission
1650 Mission St., Suite 400
San Francisco, CA 94103

Dear Mr. Ionin:

On behalf of the Carpenters Union, I am writing to oppose the San Francisco Building and Construction Trades Council's (SFBTC) proposed ordinance applying the 2016 San Francisco Building Standards Code in its entirety to factory-built housing. The ordinance would require that all factory-built multi-story housing containing four or more dwelling units comply with the City's building code, residential code, electrical code, mechanical code, and plumbing code. The proposed ordinance violates the Factory-Built Housing Law, Health and Safety Code 19960, *et seq.* The ordinance attempts to completely occupy an area of law that is occupied by state law, and would cause the carve outs set forth in Cal. Health and Safety Code section 19993 to completely swallow legislation set forth in Health and Safety code section 19990, whereby the State Department of Housing and Community Development is tasked with adopting rules and regulations in the exact same legislative area in which the proposed SF ordinance would apply.

The California Legislature unanimously adopted the Factory-Built Housing Law in 1969. It was the intention of the Legislature to specifically prohibit local jurisdictions from maintaining ordinances regulating factory-built housing. In an August 7, 1969 memorandum Charles LeMenager, Director of the California Department of Housing and Community Development, explained the bill and urged the Governor to sign it. LeMenager argued:

"AB 1971 is the single most important piece of housing legislation adopted this year. Private enterprise's attempts to factory build housing in the past have been stifled due to lack of uniformity and local building codes. AB 1971 tears down that barrier through state preemption.... This bill provides for state preemption in the manufacture of "factory-built" housing by regulation, inspection and certification by the Department of Housing and Community Development."

The legislative finding in the statute reflects this intent. Health and Safety Code section 19961 provides in part:

“... the mass production of housing, consisting primarily of factory manufacturer of dwelling units or habitable wounds thereof, presents unique problems with respect to the establishment of uniform health and safety standards and inspections procedures. The Legislature further finds and declares that by minimizing the problems of standards and inspection procedures, it is demonstrating its intention to encourage [the use of factory-built housing]”.

As is shown below, the intent and function of the statute is absolutely clear. The building code standards for the manufacture of factory-built housing are occupied entirely by the State. Local jurisdictions maintain the responsibility to inspect the site to be sure that the installation follows the manufacturer’s instructions, but plan review, application of local building codes and inspection of the manufactured product itself is strictly forbidden by the statute. The reasons laid out in the proposed ordinance are dishonest subterfuge which, if enacted, will place the City in protracted litigation which the City will surely lose.

The ordinance sets forth four justifications for placing new requirements on multi-story housing containing four or more dwelling units. First, the proposed ordinance indicates that the amendments set are “reasonably necessary because of local conditions caused by climate, geology and topography.” (Sec. 2(j)) Next, the ordinance argues that the amendments are “architectural requirements within the meaning of Health and Safety Code section 19993, and are therefore not precluded by the Factory-Built Housing Law.” (Sec. 4(g)) Third, the proposed ordinance argues that the original statute did not contemplate multi-story factory-built housing. Lastly, the proposed ordinance asserts that because the City is a Charter City, the amendments are permitted under the Home Rule doctrine. (Sec. 4(h-K)) This is magical thinking, and as shown at the end of this letter, invites the City and its individual Building Inspectors to commit a crime. This letter refutes the arguments in turn.

Regarding the ordinance’s first argument, there is no provision in the factory-built housing section of the Health and Safety Code that specifically allows a municipality to adopt regulations, “because of local conditions caused by climate, geology, and topography.” Instead, Section 4(d) of the ordinance relies on provisions of the general Building Code and grafts them into the factory-built housing portions of the code. (See Cal. Health and Safety Code 17958.5) Specifically, the proposed ordinance asserts that since the Factory Built Housing law uses the Building Code’s definition of “building standard” in Cal. Health and Safety Code 18909, “Section 18909 expressly allows amendments to the California Building Code Standards Code based on local conditions.” Section 18909 does no such thing. Instead this section merely defines building standard. There is no language in this section that authorizes amendments based on local conditions. In fact, Section 19990 specifically identifies the various uniform building codes that the State must use to create building standards for factory-built housing. It does not include Thus, contrary to the proposed ordinance’s assertion, there is no language in the Factory-built housing portion of the code that allows municipalities to amend their code based on local conditions caused by climate, geology and topography.

In the most recent amendments in 1993 and 2003 to the Factory-Built Housing Law, the Legislature remained consistent with its original intent. In the 1993 legislation, the Business, Transportation and Housing Agency explained to the legislature in relevant part:

“This bill would encourage innovative uses of manufactured housing to provide affordable multi-family housing; clarify existing law to remove local government barriers to housing; and require uniform standards for agencies which test and list building products in Roll Build Report, AB 765, September 13, 1993.

...

Existing law contained in the State Housing Law, as well as uniform building codes adopted pursuant thereto, require materials, appliances, and equipment used in housing to be tested and listed by independent testing and listing agencies to insure compliance with product standards.

This bill would establish a statutory definition of “testing and listing agency” and related terms to provide certainty to builders and local governments concerning whether a building product has been tested by an approved testing and listing agency.”

Bill Analysis, AB 765, Transportation and Housing Agency, September 13, 1993

The 2003 legislation made no changes to the pre-emptive provisions of the statute. There is no possible way that the Legislature would have intended an architectural exception that completely eliminates the entire regime of state-created rules, regulations and testing procedures.

Second, the proposed ordinance claims it involves only “architectural requirements within the meaning of Health and Safety code 19993.” (Sec. 4(g)) Here, the ordinance makes this conclusion without any reasoning, analysis, or evidence that any of the amendments involve architectural requirements. Moreover, the amendments are so broad, that authorizing the amendments under the “architectural requirements” provision of section 19993, would render Section 19990, along with all of the other substantive sections of the Factory Built Housing Law meaningless.

In Section 19961, the legislature found that, “by minimizing the problems of standards and inspection procedures, it is demonstrating its intention to encourage the reduction of housing construction costs and to make housing and home ownership more feasible for all residents of the state.” To that end, the Factory built Housing Law includes section 19990 which requires the Department of Housing and Community Development to:

[A]dopt rules and regulations to interpret and make specific this part. The department shall adopt and submit building standards for approval...for purposes described in this section. Standards adopted, amended or repealed from time to time by the department pursuant to this chapter shall include provisions imposing requirements reasonably consistent with recognized and accepted standards contained in the most recent editions

of the following international or uniform industry codes as adopted or amended from time to time by the organizations specified:

- (1) The Uniform Housing Code of the International Conference of Building Officials.
- (2) The International Building Code of the International Code Council.
- (3) The International Residential Code of the International Code Council.
- (4) (4) The Uniform Plumbing Code of the International Association of Plumbing and Mechanical Officials.
- (5) The Uniform Mechanical Code of the International Association of Plumbing and Mechanical Officials.
- (6) The National Electrical Code of the National Fire Protection Association.

In short, in Section 19990, the legislature tasked the Department of Housing and Community Development with developing rules, regulations, and building standards related to factory built housing in the areas of the housing, building, residential, plumbing, mechanical, and electrical codes.

Section 19990 also states that “in the event of any conflict with respect to factory-built housing between Part 1.5 (commencing with Section 17910) and this part, the requirements of this part shall control.” Part 1.5 of the Health and Safety Code is the “State Housing Law.” It is clear that the legislature considered that there might be conflicts between the Factory Built Housing law and the State Housing Law, thus the need to explicitly mandate that the Factory Built Housing Law shall control.

The Legislature did allow a very narrow role for local regulation. The primary reason for this is to comply with local zoning requirements and to use local building inspectors to require that contractors install the factory-built housing products in accordance with manufacturer’s instructions. Section 19993 provides:

Local use zone requirements, local snow load requirements, local wind pressure requirements, local fire zones, building setback, front and rear yard size requirements, site development and property line requirements, as well as the review and regulation of architectural and aesthetic requirements are hereby specifically and entirely reserved to local jurisdictions notwithstanding any requirement of this part.

San Francisco’s proposed ordinance relies on the above-noted section, particularly the “architectural” requirement clause to amend the City’s Building Code. The proposed amendments cover the entire spectrum of rules, regulations and building standards that the

Legislature delegated to the Department of Housing and Community Development. Specifically, Section 5 of the proposed ordinance provides:

Application of the 2016 San Francisco Building Code to Multi-Story Factory-Built Housing Containing Four or More Dwelling Units.

- (a) Factory-Built Housing containing four or more dwelling units and two or more stories shall comply with the 2016 San Francisco Building Code, consisting of the 2016 California Building Code with San Francisco's local amendments.
- (b) Factory-Built Housing containing four or more dwelling units and two or more stories shall comply with the 2016 San Francisco Residential Code, consisting of the 2016 California Residential Code with San Francisco's local amendments.
- (c) Factory-Built Housing containing four or more dwelling units and two or more stories shall comply with the 2016 San Francisco Electrical Code, consisting of the 2016 California Electrical Code with San Francisco's local amendments.
- (d) Factory-Built Housing containing four or more dwelling units and two or more stories shall comply with the 2016 San Francisco Mechanical Code, consisting of the 2016 California Mechanical Code with San Francisco's local amendments.
- (e) Factory-Built Housing containing four or more dwelling units and two or more stories shall comply with the 2016 San Francisco Plumbing Code, consisting of the 2016 California Plumbing Code with San Francisco's local amendments.

The ordinance reads Health and Safety Code section 19993 entirely out of context. The purpose of this section is to allow the inspection of the installation, the site and other uniformly applied zoning requirements. One of the Attorney General opinions the ordinance relies on for the proposition that a local entity can impose uniformly applied architectural requirements actually says that a local government cannot do exactly what the proposed San Francisco ordinance would do. In that case, the local ordinance was invalid because its "architectural and aesthetic consideration" rules were combined with an application for a use permit and the possible requirement of a public hearing. Since this functioned only to apply to factory-built housing, the Attorney General argued that the local ordinance violated the statute. (*City of South Lake Tahoe*, 55 Ops.Cal.Atty. Gen 234, 235.) 1973 Cal. A.G. LEXIS 63. Here, the San Francisco ordinance would apply only to multi-story factory-built housing, thus, excluding single story housing, mobile homes and "tiny houses." This is exactly the kind of uneven application the Attorney General objected to in *City of South Lake Tahoe*.

Third, the proposed ordinance also asserts that proposed amendments are permissible under the "Home Rule" doctrine. The reasoning in the ordinance is frivolous. Factory-built housing is a matter of state-wide concern. Health and Safety Code section 19961. The California Supreme Court case the ordinance cites indicating regulation of multi-unit housing has been recognized to be a municipal affair subject to home rule does not stand for that proposition and even if it did, it has been superseded by statute. (*Bishop v. San Jose* (1969) 1 Cal.3d 56, 63.) The question in *Bishop* was whether the prevailing wage requirements of the Labor Code apply when a City uses its own employees to perform construction work. The Court correctly rejected the plaintiff's argument. In determining whether the prevailing wage statute is a matter of state-wide concern and therefore, not subject to the Home Rule Doctrine, the Court made the following observation:

"In exercising the judicial function of deciding whether a matter is a municipal affair or of state-wide concern, the courts will of course give great weight to the purpose of the Legislature in enacting general laws which disclose an intent to preempt the field to the exclusion of local regulation."

1 Cal.3d at 63. (emphasis added.)

To the extent that *Bishop* stands for the proposition that regulation of multi-unit housing is a matter of Home Rule, it has been legislatively superseded. The Supreme Court decided *Bishop* on October 30, 1969. Although the Factory-Built Housing Act had been adopted by the Legislature and signed by the Governor earlier that summer, it did not take effect until the Commission created in former Section 19994 had met and made recommendations for the promulgation of rules and regulations to be adopted by the State. Worse yet for the proposed ordinance, one of the Attorney General opinions that the ordinance relies on provides that factory-built housing is a matter of general and state-wide concern. (*City of Torrance*, 53 Ops. Cal. Atty. Gen 354, 355.) Cal. A.G. LEXIS 92

Section 4c. of the ordinance argues that the Factory-Built Housing law does not contemplate anything beyond small, single story residential developments and the Legislature did not contemplate multi-story large developments. The statement in the proposed ordinance is false because it does not report that the context of the discussion was comparing mobile home manufacture with modular unit manufacture.

The Assembly Committee on Urban Affairs and Housing met to further investigate factory built housing on April 12, 1969. The meeting occurred in the premises of Boise Cascade Building Company on Airport Boulevard in Los Angeles. A Boise Cascade official, Robert Swafeld compared mobile homes with modular factory built housing. The full context of the discussion follows:

"We can convert from the mobile home category into some form of factory relocatable product. When we talk of sectionalized house, we are speaking of a single story unit of two or more pieces that are joined --- two models of ten or twelve put together.

Modular units are both on the production line, but they go up. We can do L's or H's or that type of thing.

We have built field perimeter-type units for apartment houses. We are currently involved in Chicago in townhouse construction which will be wood perimeter frame – two story. In the South, we are building single story sectionalized housing. We are currently building in Woodland, California vacation homes for the rapidly expanding vacation homes market. Urban Affairs and Housing Committee meeting, April 12, 1969, p. 3.

This shows that the Committee that sponsored the legislation knew that modular factory built housing products could go “up” while mobile homes cannot. The Legislature knew that factory-built housing was capable of multi-story construction at the time of enactment in 1969.

Further, the State has been regulating multi-story modular construction since the Legislature passed the Factory-Built Housing statute in 1969. Since 1969, factory-built multi-story projects have been constructed throughout California. For example, in 1972, the GreenFair Apartments project in Sacramento was completed. GreenFair is a nine-story apartment building at 701-702 Fairground Drive, currently managed by Sacramento Self Help Housing. The building was constructed using factory built modules that were built in Ohio, shipped by rail and truck, and installed on site. GreenFair was part of a Department of Housing and Urban Development project, “Operation Breakthrough,” which was “launched... in 1969 to stimulate volume production of quality housing for all income levels. Factory built housing offered a logical means – then as it does now—for the housing industry to grow and prosper.”²

Since the construction of the GreenFair Apartment, the Legislature has taken four additional opportunities to modify the factory-built housing statute. Neither in the changed statutory language nor in the legislative history, is there any mention of restricting factory-built housing to a single story.

Finally, the enactment of this ordinance would be a crime. Section 19997 provides:

“Any person who violates any of the provisions of this part or any rules or regulations adopted pursuant to this part is guilty of a misdemeanor, punishable by a fine not exceeding \$500 or by imprisonment not exceeding thirty days, or both such fine and imprisonment.”

At the behest of the San Francisco Building Trades Council this proposed ordinance is an attempt to interfere and obstruct our recently unionized factories from providing much needed

² “Operation Breakthrough. Phase II. Prototype Construction and Demonstration. Volume 4. U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. Office of Policy Development and Research. https://www.huduser.gov/portal/publications/destech/pro_cons_brkthr.html. Accessed May 3, 2018

housing to San Franciscans at all income levels. The arguments of the SFBCTC included in the proposed ordinance will not withstand legal attack, are based in misrepresentation of facts, are defamatory statements about the quality of the products and invites the individual building inspectors and their bosses to commit crimes. We will continue to do everything in our power to defend our members in the factories and these employers that are creating local middle class jobs.

For over one hundred years the Carpenters Union has been delivering the highest quality construction of all types to the citizens of San Francisco and we will continue to do so with our factory built housing.

The Carpenters Union urges the City not to entertain this false, misleading and illegal proposed ordinance.

Sincerely,



Jay Bradshaw
Director of Organizing
Northern Carpenters Regional Council



RECEIVED

MAY 15 2018

CITY & COUNTY OF S.F.
PLANNING DEPARTMENT
CPC/HPC

May 10, 2018

Planning Commission
San Francisco Planning Department
1650 Mission St., #400
San Francisco, CA 94103

Dear President Hillis and Commissioners,

I am writing to you in support of Healthy Spot and its effort to open a new store at 4049 24th Street in Noe Valley.

Unlike giant chain stores, Healthy Spot is a community-oriented business, owned by Andrew Kim and Mark Boonnark, who are conscientious and ethical.

In our personal experience with Andrew and Mark, they have proven themselves to have the highest quality standards for their products and services. They have been extraordinarily professional and attentive in their business dealings with us and others.

There is no question that Healthy Spot would be a positive addition to any merchant corridor. I urge that you approve their application without delay.

Sincerely,

Marie Atake
Founder & President

MOHCD
One South Van Ness Avenue
5th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94103

Presort
First Class Mail
CombisPrice



U.S. POSTAGE >> PITNEY BOWES



ZIP 94103 \$ 000.37⁸

02 4W 0000246600 MAY 10 2018

RECEIVED

MAY 15 2018

CITY & COUNTY OF S.F.
PLANNING DEPARTMENT
RECEPTION DESK

Planning

San Francisco Planning Commission
1650 Mission Street
San Francisco CA 94103

DVV-SEB 94103



Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development
City and County of San Francisco



Mark Farrell
Mayor

Kate Hartley
Director

May 8, 2018

Please join the Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development in continued conversation regarding an interim use for 730 Stanyan, the former McDonald's site.

730 STANYAN COMMUNITY MEETING

Thursday, May 17, 2018, 6pm – 7:30pm

John Adams Center – 1860 Hayes Street, auditorium

For those who cannot attend in person, the meeting will be live streamed:

<http://sfgovtv.org/mohcd-meeting>

We will discuss the results of community input gathered at the meeting held April 26th and summarize 3 proposals we've received to date. If you have a proposed use you'd like to share with the community and the use serves or employs low to moderate income persons, benefits the community as a whole, and is financially self-sufficient, please contact Joan.McNamara@sfgov.org to submit your proposal for staff review. If your proposal meets all the requirements listed above, we will summarize your proposal at an upcoming meeting.

We will hold an additional community meeting on **Saturday, June 16, 2018**, 10am – 12 noon. Location information will be announced prior to the meeting.

We value the input of all community members and look forward to seeing you on May 17, or to hearing from you via <https://sfmohcd.org/730-stanyan>.

Rob Ruetsch
642 Alvarado St. Apt 103
San Francisco, CA 94114
rob.ruetsch@gmail.com

RECEIVED

MAY 11 2018

CITY & COUNTY OF S.F.
PLANNING DEPARTMENT
CPC/HPC

May 8, 2018

San Francisco Planning Commission
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400
San Francisco, California 94103
commissions.secretary@sfgov.org

RE: Case No. 2017-014693CUA, Philz Coffee Conditional Use Application for 2230 Polk Street – **Letter of Opposition**

Dear Commissioners:

I am writing to oppose the application of Philz Coffee for a conditional use of 2230 Polk Street as a coffee house.

Within a few blocks of the proposed site are 2 national coffee formula retail locations (Starbucks, Peets), 3 independent small coffee shops, and several eateries offering coffee/espresso drinks. Adding another coffee shop in such close proximity goes against the Commission Guide for Formula Retail in which it is clear that it is neither necessary nor desirable in the neighborhood. San Francisco needs to protect its vibrant small business sector and create a supportive environment for new business innovations.

The Conditional Use Authorization for Formula Retail Uses was created in an effort to protect San Francisco's small business sector. The increase in formula retail coffee businesses in Russian Hill/Northern Polk Street does not support small business or promote a diverse retail base and thus does not enhance the unique social, cultural and esthetic qualities of the City and neighborhood.

We are asking that you please disapprove the Conditional Use Authorization application for this project.

Thank you,



Rob Ruetsch

Lisandrea Duque
4152058556
lisa.duque@gmail.com

RECEIVED

May 8, 2018

MAY 11 2018

San Francisco Planning Commission
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400
San Francisco, California 94103
commissions.secretary@sfgov.org

CITY & COUNTY OF S.F.
PLANNING DEPARTMENT
CPC/HPC

RE: Case No. 2017-014693CUA, Philz Coffee Conditional Use Application for 2230 Polk Street – **Letter of Opposition**

Dear Commissioners:

I am writing to oppose the application of Philz Coffee for a conditional use of 2230 Polk Street as a coffee house.

Within a few blocks of the proposed site are 2 national coffee formula retail locations (Starbucks, Peets), 3 independent small coffee shops, and several eateries offering coffee/espresso drinks. Adding another coffee shop in such close proximity goes against the Commission Guide for Formula Retail in which it is clear that it is neither necessary nor desirable in the neighborhood. San Francisco needs to protect its vibrant small business sector and create a supportive environment for new business innovations.

The Conditional Use Authorization for Formula Retail Uses was created in an effort to protect San Francisco's small business sector. The increase in formula retail coffee businesses in Russian Hill/Northern Polk Street does not support small business or promote a diverse retail base and thus does not enhance the unique social, cultural and esthetic qualities of the City and neighborhood.

We are asking that you please disapprove the Conditional Use Authorization application for this project.

Thank you,

Lisandrea Duque



From: [Secretary, Commissions \(CPC\)](#)
To: [Feliciano, Josephine \(CPC\)](#)
Subject: FW: 1863 Mission Street: response to yesterday's submission by the DR requestors
Date: Wednesday, May 16, 2018 11:29:26 AM
Attachments: [image007.png](#)
[image008.png](#)
[image009.png](#)
[image010.png](#)
[2018-04-30 Response to Discretionary Review \(DRP\) SKMBT C22018043013380.PDF](#)
[Mission Interim controls analysis.DOCX](#)

*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: Steven Vettel [mailto:SVettel@fbm.com]
Sent: Wednesday, May 16, 2018 11:11 AM
To: richhillissf@yahoo.com; Melgar, Myrna (CPC); planning@rodneyfong.com; Richards, Dennis (CPC); Millicent A. Johnson (millicent.johnson@sfgov.org); Koppel, Joel (CPC); Moore, Kathrin (CPC); Secretary, Commissions (CPC)
Cc: Ajello Hoagland, Linda (CPC); Michael J Mamone; Stephen Antonaros; Sucre, Richard (CPC); Rahaim, John (CPC)
Subject: 1863 Mission Street: response to yesterday's submission by the DR requestors

Commissioners, I represent Michael Mamone, the project sponsor of the 1863 Mission Street project that will be before you tomorrow for a discretionary review hearing. The Department is recommending that you deny the request and approve the project. The DR requestors' statement was due on the date they filed the DR request (March 16) and our response to that statement was due several weeks prior to the DR hearing. We filed our response on April 30 and a copy was provided to the DR requestor. Our response is in your commission packet and a copy is attached.

Yesterday, DR requestors Kelly Hill and Larisa Pedroncelli emailed you a new "full" DR statement making new arguments. They failed to provide us a copy. Planner Linda Hoagland did so this morning. Because we had no opportunity to respond to these new arguments in our April 30 response, I would urge the Commission to disregard yesterday's DR statement, or if not, consider our brief responses below.

DR Argument 1. Priority Policy 1 (That existing neighborhood-serving retails uses be preserved and enhanced and future opportunities for resident employment in and ownership of such businesses enhanced). The site is vacant and contains no existing neighborhood-serving uses. The proposed 1,425 square foot commercial space is not large. Active commercial spaces are required to be provided on the ground floor of buildings in the Mission NCT zoning district by Planning Code Section 145.5(d)(1). There is no indication that this small commercial space will attract a "high-end" commercial tenant, particularly because the building will be designed without

kitchen venting that would be required for its use as a restaurant. In addition, the recent 2018 amendments to the Mission NCT zoning ordinance (part of the Mission 2020 program) now prohibit all non-retail sales and services (offices) in the district, except for trade shops, catering and design professionals. Accordingly, the small size of the commercial space, the design of the building and the new restrictions placed on Mission NCT commercial uses will combine to make it highly unlikely that a high-end commercial establishment will locate here. The project is consistent with Priority Policy 1 by providing future opportunities for resident employment and/or ownership of a small commercial business.

DR Argument 2. Priority Policy 2 (That existing housing and neighborhood character be conserved and protected in order to preserve the cultural and economic diversity of our neighborhoods). There is no existing housing on the site; rather it is vacant lot used for surface parking. The DR requestors argue that the commercial space's "tall glass windows is out of character for Mission Street" and that the residential windows above are too large and out of character. As to the commercial space, Planning Code Section 145.1(c)(4) requires storefronts on Mission Street to have a minimum 14-foot floor-to floor heights, and Section 145.1(c)(6) requires the storefronts to be "fenestrated with transparent windows and doorways for no less than 60 percent of the street frontage at the ground level and allow visibility to the inside of the building." Accordingly, the sponsor has no choice but to provide a tall transparent ground floor storefront. In addition, we dispute that the storefront as designed is out of character with Mission Street. It incorporates a traditional bulkhead, multiple glass panes separated by mullions and a sign band at the transom height. As to the residential windows, a glance at the Mission Street façade design belies this point entirely. The residential windows are rather small double hung traditional windows, separated by large areas of solid wall. Planning Code Section 136 requires "[t]he glass areas of each bay window. . . shall be not less than 50 percent of the sum of the areas of the vertical surfaces of such bay window". These residential bay windows are consistent with the character of this mixed commercial/residential block and the Mission Street corridor in general, and meet minimum Planning Code glass area requirements.

DR Argument 3. Mission Area Plan Objective 2.1 - Policy 2.3.2 (Prioritize the development of affordable family housing, both rental and ownership, particularly along transit corridors and adjacent to community amenities). The project site is 8,000 square feet and the project proposes only 37 units. It is too small for MOHCD to acquire for a 100% affordable development and far too small for a lot split and land dedication. Accordingly, it is not an appropriate site for a 100% affordable family housing development. As discussed in the attached April 30 response, Mr. Mamone will comply with the inclusionary affordable housing requirement by providing 4 on-site BMR units, equivalent to the 12% requirement imposed by the Board of Supervisors in the July 2017 amendments to Section 415.3 for project in the pipeline before January 1, 2013.

DR Argument 4. Mission Area Plan Objective 2.3 (Discretionary Review should be limited as much as possible while still ensuring adequate community review). The delays imposed on this project were of the City's own making, not Mr. Mamone's. The 2016 Mission Interim Controls newly imposed a Large Project Authorization requirement on this principally permitted development, and then the Department did not schedule the LPA hearing until January 2018. We met with United to Save the Mission in December 2017, provided an offer to the group for certain project modifications

later that month, but never received a reply. We provided the analysis required by the Mission Interim Controls in advance of the January 2018 hearing date (copy attached). Four days before the hearing date, the interim controls expired and the Planning Department, over Mr. Mamone's objection, pulled the matter from the calendar and initiated a new round of public notice, another community meeting, this DR request, and another meeting with the DR requestors and United to Save the Mission. Tomorrow's hearing date is a full 4 months after the project was scheduled to be heard by the Commission in January. Accordingly, as detailed in the attached response, there has been adequate community review, and there are no exceptional or extraordinary circumstances that justify the Commission taking DR.

DR Argument 5. Proposed Alternatives or Changes. The DR requestors' demands are numerous and provided no opportunity for Mr. Mamone to resolve in good faith this DR matter. They seek a storefront design not allowed by Section 145.1 of the Planning Code; a long-term lease for the entire 1,425 sf commercial space to a community non-profit at less than half market rent; and a significant increase in the on-site inclusionary percentage. Mr. Mamone's prior offer to lease half of the commercial space at a reduced rent was rejected by the DR requestors. As detailed in the attached April 30 response, given the substantial carry costs Mr. Mamone has incurred holding this property through the Eastern Neighborhoods rezoning, the recession, the Mission Interim Controls and the latest delays, he is not in a position to increase voluntarily the project's inclusionary housing burden.

As recommended by the Planning Department, there are no exceptional or extraordinary circumstances that justify DR in this case. This project provides 37 new rental homes with no displacement, is Code compliant, removes a blighting surface parking lot, and provides the Code-required tall Mission Street storefront with the Code mandated transparency. Finally, the project enjoys significant support, particularly from those living in the immediate vicinity.

Steven L. Vettel

Partner

svettel@fbm.com

D 415.954.4902 C 415.850.1931



235 Montgomery Street 17th FL
San Francisco, CA 94104

www.fbm.com

-----Original Message-----

From: Ajello Hoagland, Linda (CPC) [mailto:linda.ajellohoagland@sfgov.org]

Sent: Wednesday, May 16, 2018 7:34 AM

To: michaeljmamone@yahoo.com; Vettel, Steven (25) x4902; Stephen Antonaros

Subject: FW: 1863 Mission Street (Case NO. 2009.1001DRP) - full statement by DR requestors

Attached is the DR Statement that was sent out by the DR Requestor yesterday.

Regards,
Linda

-----Original Message-----

From: factory 1 design [mailto:design@factory1.com]

Sent: Tuesday, May 15, 2018 12:25 PM

To: Rich Hillis; Melgar, Myrna (CPC); Rodney Fong; Johnson, Milicent (CPC); Koppel, Joel (CPC); Moore, Kathrin (CPC); Richards, Dennis (CPC); Secretary, Commissions (CPC)

Cc: Ajello Hoagland, Linda (CPC); Ronen, Hillary; Beinart, Amy (BOS); Rahaim, John (CPC); Sucre, Richard (CPC)

Subject: 1863 Mission Street (Case NO. 2009.1001DRP) - full statement by DR requestors

Dear Planning Commissioners -

Please find our attached full DR statement ahead of our hearing this Thursday, May 17.

Yours respectfully,

Kelly Hill
Larisa Pedroncelli
1875 Mission Street #110

This e-mail message is for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) and may contain confidential and privileged information. Any unauthorized review, use, disclosure or distribution is prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender by reply e-mail and destroy all copies of the original message. Thank you.

Farella Braun + Martel LLP

This email has been scanned for email related threats and delivered safely by Mimecast.
For more information please visit <http://www.mimecast.com>
