

# SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING COMMISSION



## Meeting Minutes

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

**Thursday, June 7, 2018**  
**1:00 p.m.**  
**Regular Meeting**

**COMMISSIONERS PRESENT:** Fong, Hillis, Johnson, Koppel, Melgar, Moore, Richards

**THE MEETING WAS CALLED TO ORDER BY PRESIDENT HILLIS AT 1:05 PM**

**STAFF IN ATTENDANCE:** Dan Sider, Tim Frye, Jacob Bintliff, Marcelle Boudreaux, Kimia Haddadan, Susan Gygi, Audrey Harris, Natalia Kwiatkowska, John Rahaim – Director of Planning, Jonas P. Ionin –Commission Secretary

**SPEAKER KEY:**

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

### **A. CONSIDERATION OF ITEMS PROPOSED FOR CONTINUANCE**

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

1. 2018-004612CND (D. WEISSGLASS: (415) 575-9177)  
228-230 CLAYTON STREET – east side of Clayton Street between Hayes and Fell Streets; Lot 024 in Assessor’s Block 1210 (District 5) – Request for a **Condominium Conversion Subdivision**, pursuant to Subdivision Code Sections 1332 and 1381, to convert a four-story, five-unit building into residential condominiums. The subject property is located within a RH-3 (Residential – House, Three Family) Zoning District and 40-X Height and Bulk District.

The project was determined not to be a project under CEQA Guidelines Sections 15060(c) and 15378 because there is no direct or indirect physical change in the environment.

(Continued from Regular hearing on May 24, 2018)

**Note: On May 24, 2018, after being pulled off of Consent; A motion to approve failed +3 -2 (Johnson, Melgar against; Richards absent); Continued to June 7, 2018 by a vote of +5 -1 (Moore against; Richards absent).**

**(Proposed Continuance to June 21, 2018)**

SPEAKERS: None

ACTION: Continued to June 21, 2018

AYES: Fong, Hillis, Johnson, Koppel, Melgar, Moore, Richards

2. 2016-009062DRP (N. TRAN: (415) 575-9174)  
505 GRAND VIEW AVENUE - corner of Grand View Avenue and Elizabeth Street, Lot 044 in Assessor's Block 2828 (District 8) - Requests for **Discretionary Review** of Building Permit Application No. 2016.11.23.3441, proposing to construct three new accessory dwelling units at the ground and basement levels and interior/exterior tenant improvements and Building Permit Application No. 2016.06.30.1337 proposing to construct a fourth floor vertical addition to the existing six-unit 3-story over basement residential building with additional interior remodeling and new roof decks within a RM-1 (Residential-Mixed, Low Density) Zoning District and 40-X Height and Bulk District. This action constitutes the Approval Action for the project for the purposes of CEQA, pursuant to San Francisco Administrative Code Section [31.04\(h\)](#).  
 Staff Analysis: Full Review  
*Preliminary Recommendation: Do Not Take Discretionary Review and Approve*  
 (Continued from Regular Meeting on March 1, 2018)  
**(Proposed Continuance to August 30, 2018)**

SPEAKERS: None

ACTION: Continued to August 30, 2018

AYES: Fong, Hillis, Johnson, Koppel, Melgar, Moore, Richards

3. 2015-009015DRP-03 (E. JARDINES: (415) 575-9144)  
75, 77, 79-81 LELAND AVENUE – located on the south side of Leland Avenue, west of Desmond Street, east of Talbert Court, and north of Visitacion Avenue; Lots: 007B and 030 in Assessor's Block 6250 (District 10) - Request for **Discretionary Review** of Building Permit Application Nos. 2015.0629.0164, 2015.0629.0165, and 2015.0629.0158, to construct three new buildings including two two-story, single-family homes (addressed as 75 and 77 Leland Avenue) and one new three-story mixed-use building with ground floor retail professional service and residential above (addressed as 79-81 Leland Avenue). The Project is located within an RH-1 (Residential, House, One-Family) as well as a NC-2 (Neighborhood Commercial-Small Scale) Zoning District and 40-X Height and Bulk District. This action constitutes the Approval Action for the project for the purposes of CEQA, pursuant to San Francisco Administrative Code Section [31.04\(h\)](#).  
 Staff Analysis: Full Discretionary Review  
*Preliminary Recommendation: Do Not Take Discretionary Review and Approve*  
 (Continued from Regular hearing on May 3, 2018)  
**Note: On March 15, 2018, after hearing and closing public comment, continued to May 3, 2018 by a vote of +7 -0.**

**On May 3, 2018, without hearing, continued to June 7, 2018 by a vote of +4 -0 (Johnson, Melgar, Richards absent).  
(Proposed for Indefinite Continuance)**

SPEAKERS: None  
 ACTION: Continued Indefinitely  
 AYES: Fong, Hillis, Johnson, Koppel, Melgar, Moore, Richards

4. 2014-003160CUA (D. VU: (415) 575-9120)  
3314 CESAR CHAVEZ STREET – north side between Mission Street and South Van Ness Avenue - Lot 012 in Assessor's Block 6571 (District 9) - Request for **Conditional Use Authorization**, pursuant to Planning Code Sections 121.1 and 303 for the demolition of an existing 13,000 sq. ft. light industrial building and construction of a 65-ft. tall, six-story and 49,475 sq. ft. mixed-use building that includes approximately 11,430 sq. ft. of ground floor commercial retail and 48,365 sq. ft. of residential use for 58 dwelling units. The proposed project would also include a total 9,020 sq. ft. of private and common residential open space, 62 Class 1 bicycle parking spaces, and an approximately 6,300 sq. ft. basement-level garage for 27 accessory automobile and 1 car-share parking spaces. The subject properties are located within a Mission Street Neighborhood Commercial Transit (NCT) Zoning District and 65-X Height and Bulk District. This action constitutes the Approval Action for the project for the purposes of CEQA, pursuant to San Francisco Administrative Code Section [31.04\(h\)](#).

*Preliminary Recommendation: Approve with Conditions*  
 (Continued from Regular Meeting on April 26, 2018)

**Note: On February 8, 2018, after hearing and closing public comment, continued to March 22, 2018 by a vote of +5 -0 (Johnson and Hillis absent). On March 22, 2018, without hearing, continued to April 26, 2018 by a vote of +6 -0 (Fong absent). On April 26, 2018, without hearing, continued to June 7, 2018 by a vote of +6 -0 (Melgar absent).  
(Proposed for Indefinite Continuance)**

SPEAKERS: None  
 ACTION: Continued Indefinitely  
 AYES: Fong, Hillis, Johnson, Koppel, Melgar, Moore, Richards

5. 2018-002007CUA (A. LINDSAY: (415) 575-9178)  
318 MAIN STREET – southwest corner of the Folsom Street and Main Street intersection, Lot 064 of Assessor's Block 3746 (District 9) - Request for a **Conditional Use Authorization**, pursuant to Planning Code Sections 209.3 and 303(c), to install a permanent rooftop AT&T Mobility Macro Wireless Telecommunications Facility which will replace an existing temporary rooftop wireless facility. The project scope of work consists of installation of (3) new panel antennas screened behind a new radio-frequency (RF) transparent screen wall; installation of (6) new RRHs; reusing (6) existing panel antennas and ancillary equipment screened behind existing RF transparent screen walls; and installation of ancillary equipment. All antennas, RF screen walls, cabling, and brackets will be painted and textured to match the existing penthouse building wall as part of the AT&T Mobility Telecommunications Network. The subject property is located within a RC-4 (Residential – Commercial, High Density) and 400-W Height and Bulk Districts.

**WITHDRAWN**

15. [2014-001400ENX](#) (E. SAMONSKY: (415) 575-9112)  
2750 19<sup>TH</sup> STREET – located at the northeast corner of Bryant and 19<sup>th</sup> Streets, Lot 004A in Assessor’s Block 4023 (District 10) - Request for a **Large Project Authorization**, pursuant to Planning Code Section 329, for the demolition of an existing industrial building, with the exception of the brick facade, and new construction of a six-story, 68-foot tall, mixed-use building (measuring approximately 72,365 square feet) with 60 dwelling units, approximately 10,000 square feet ground floor Production, Distribution and Repair (PDR) space, 24 below-grade off-street parking spaces, two car-share parking space, 84 Class 1 bicycle parking spaces, and 13 Class 2 bicycle parking spaces. The Project includes 4,800 square feet of common open space roof deck. Under the LPA, the project is seeking an exception to certain Planning Code requirements, including: 1) rear yard (Planning Code Section 134) and 2) dwelling unit exposure (Planning Code Section 140). The project site is located within the UMU (Urban Mixed-Use) and 68-X Height and Bulk District. This action constitutes the Approval Action for the project for the purposes of CEQA, pursuant to San Francisco Administrative Code Section [31.04](#)(h).  
 (Continued from Regular Meeting on May 10, 2018)  
*Preliminary Recommendation: Approve with Conditions*  
**Note: On November 20, 2017, after hearing and closing public comment, continued to January 25, 2018 by a vote of +5 -1 (Johnson against; Hillis absent).**  
**On January 25, 2018, after hearing and closing public comment, continued to March 15, 2018 by a vote of +4 -1 (Melgar against; Fong, Johnson absent).**  
**On March 15, 2018, without hearing, continued to May 10, 2018 by a vote of +6 -0 (Melgar absent).**  
**On May 10, 2018, without hearing, continued to June 7, 2018 by a vote of +6 -0 (Richards absent).**

SPEAKERS: None  
 ACTION: Continued to June 28, 2018  
 AYES: Fong, Hillis, Johnson, Koppel, Melgar, Moore, Richards

17. [2014.0231CUA](#) (N. KWIATKOWSKA: (415) 575-9185)  
331 PENNSYLVANIA STREET – east side between 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> Streets; Lot 026 of Assessor’s Block 4040 (District 10) - Request for **Conditional Use Authorization**, pursuant to Planning Code Sections 207, 209.1, and 303, to construct up to one dwelling unit per 1,500 square feet of lot area and for a change of use from Institutional (residential care facility) to Residential (seven dwelling units) in the RH-2 Zoning District. The project includes an interior remodel, addition of rear decks, and changes to the exterior. The subject property is located within a RH-2 (Residential, House, Two-Family) Zoning District and 40-X Height and Bulk District. This action constitutes the Approval Action for the project for the purposes of CEQA, pursuant to San Francisco Administrative Code Section [31.04](#)(h).  
*Preliminary Recommendation: Approve with Conditions*

SPEAKERS: Larry Nibby – Ready to present today  
 ACTION: Continued to June 21, 2018  
 AYES: Fong, Hillis, Johnson, Koppel, Melgar, Moore, Richards

## B. COMMISSION MATTERS

6. Consideration of Adoption:

- [Draft Minutes for May 17, 2018 – Closed Session](#)
- [Draft Minutes for May 17, 2018 – Regular](#)
- [Draft Minutes for May 24, 2018 – Regular](#)

SPEAKERS: None  
ACTION: Adopted  
AYES: Fong, Hillis, Johnson, Koppel, Melgar, Moore, Richards

## 7. Commission Comments/Questions

### **Commissioner Richards:**

So I've been gone nearly three weeks, so I get a little extra time here to do Dennis's corner, as Commissioner Johnson says. I was in Pennsylvania and I went there on a Tuesday night, May 22<sup>nd</sup>, Wednesday, May 23<sup>rd</sup>, I woke up, Pittsburgh Post Gazette, front page of the Post Gazette says "Bloomfield confronts rising cost of housing. Concern grows amid new development." Bloomfield used to be a working class neighborhood in Pittsburgh, and I actually had relatives that lived there. They actually interviewed some people that lived in Bloomfield and one of the persons that they interviewed doesn't own a car. She takes the bus everywhere, but she's concerned that she will not be able to live there much longer because of the rising housing cost. Pittsburgh doesn't have rent control. Real estate shows a steady increase in Bloomfield, are you sitting down? The price on average went from \$116,000 to \$179,000. That's still a big jump for somebody that doesn't make a lot of money. The other thing that was notable, and I'm drawing a parallel here to San Francisco and everywhere else, the woman that was interviewed said in previous years she used to hear that more residents wanted to attract development and investment, but they don't hear that anymore. Now, what they're hearing is, how do I actually, am I able to stay here in Bloomfield, and live, because of the rising cost and she quoted, "Almost no one living in Bloomfield can afford to rent a unit there, then is that building truly going to be reflective of what Bloomfield really is or is it going to ultimately change the neighborhood that everybody's buying into?" Google has set up offices close by and apparently a lot of people are buying homes and displacing people. They end up with a quote from one of the city officials of Pittsburgh saying, "We're not quite Seattle, yet." So when you actually hear what's going on around the U.S., it's not just here in San Francisco.

One other interesting one is -- while I was in Pennsylvania, New York Times, Sunday, June 3<sup>rd</sup>, on the very front page, talks about Vancouver. Vancouver has become so expensive that the new provincial government in Vancouver wants to tax the real estate market into submission and many homeowners, most who will lose money on their investments, actually support that idea. What they're talking about is the fact that supply in Vancouver has actually increased more than the population yet prices have not decreased. So homeowners and their relatives are actually very concerned and have a high level of anxiety that their children can't live anymore in Vancouver and that something needs to be done. Interestingly enough, our own Gil Kelly, who is an alumnus of this Department here, is quoted as saying, he's quoted in here, "Vancouver consistently produced new housing, over the past decade. Housing stock has grown by 12%, while population has grown by only 9%." It's getting, Mr. Kelly says "It's getting out of the mind-set that just more is better. The City Manager of Planning and Urban Design, we need to do something different." So they're actually talking about having an increase in vacancy tax and foreign

buyer tax in Vancouver and potentially, I think that's something that this city should at least investigate and look at the data around what's going on here.

A couple of other things, I had lunch with Joe Toboni yesterday and we were talking about why things aren't getting built and he said the tariffs that were just put in place by the Trump Administration increased the price of concrete by 40%. So he said if you don't have a future contract to actually purchase concrete, it's going to be so much more expensive to build buildings that contain concrete in the future that we're going to see building even go down further.

I did get a chance to see the very opening of the Commission hearing on the week that I wasn't here and we were talking about the Housing Balance report and the fact that the Westside needs to contribute more housing. I remember Commissioner Melgar said that -- and then Director Rahaim jump in and said "We have a capacity of 125,000 with the current zoning. We're investigating why things aren't getting built." I'd really like to understand, once that investigation is done. And have an informational hearing at the Commission on what the deal is, with why things are not getting built. Thanks for taking the time to listen to me.

## C. DEPARTMENT MATTERS

### 8. Director's Announcements

#### **Director John Rahaim:**

No new announcements except to say that I lived in the Bloomfield neighborhood of Pittsburgh for several years and it's very interesting to see the changes there.

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

#### **LAND USE COMMITTEE**

##### **Dan Sider, Director of Executive Programs:**

Dan Sider, Department Staff, standing in today for Aaron Starr, who is out of the office. Very quiet week in City Hall of course. Three particular items to report to you - firstly, the Land Use Committee on Monday heard a reauthorization of what we've kind of referred to over time, as the Hooper Legislation. This was a Planning Code Amendment sponsored by, Supervisor Cohen that reactivated a provision in the Code that had sunset in this provision; incentivize the construction of more PDR space in very specific PDRs and parcels by allowing for the development of non-PDR uses, namely office space. You had heard the item on the 3<sup>rd</sup> of May and unanimously recommended approval. The Land Use Committee did feel very similarly and unanimously voted to move the matter forward to the Full Board with a recommendation for approval. The second item to bring to your attention is the Full Board action on first read for Supervisor Peskin's increase to the transportation sustainability fee for large, nonresidential projects. This ordinance was amended at the Board to exempt projects with a development agreement, approved prior to January 30<sup>th</sup> of this year, namely Mission Bay and Pier 70 from those increased fees. Commissioners, you have reviewed this on the 17<sup>th</sup> of May and similarly recommended approval. Final note, Commissioners, some of you may have read this in the paper - Mayor Farrell and Supervisor Peskin introduced jointly a piece of legislation to introduce some flexibility to

the proposition and office allocation program. The legislation would allow in very general terms office space constructed before Prop M was effective -- would allow office space of that sort that since been converted to non-office uses to revert into the office allocation cap so that it could be reallocated for new office development projects. Commissioners, that's what I have to report to you, happy to answer any questions.

## **BOARD OF APPEALS**

### **Scott Sanchez, Zoning Administrator:**

Board of Appeals did meet last night; two items that may be of interest to the Commission relate to the property at 799 Castro Street. You had heard this before as a conditional use authorization and a DR; it's demolition of a corner non-conforming building now containing non-conforming commercial use in a residential unit, unit has an ADU. The Board heard an appeal of a letter of determination request by the adjacent property owner seeking clarification of the process; they then appealed this letter of determination to the Board of Appeals as well as an appeal of the variance decision that was required for the new construction. At the hearing the Board of Appeals unanimously upheld both of those decisions. The conditional use, as you probably know, was appealed to the Board of Supervisors and unanimously upheld by the Board of Supervisors.

## **HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION**

### **Tim Frye, Preservation Officer:**

Here to share with you a few items from yesterday's Historic Preservation Commission hearing. Before the full hearing, the Architectural Review Committee met. They heard the Civic Center Public Realm Plan presentation that this Commission heard several weeks ago and overall are very supportive of the community outreach process and the design process that is currently under way. However, the ARC did request that the design group come back to the ARC before the November hearing date that's scheduled to show the preferred plan. The primary reason was the Commission or the ARC members would like to provide some additional feedback before the final plan is presented publicly. The second item the ARC heard was for the new Floating Fire Boat Station at Pier 22 ½. This is just below the Bay Bridge. Fire Station 35 is an individual landmark structure and as the new fire station is floating in the bay, this was the only opportunity that the Commission would have in reviewing the design of that new station and its relationship to the landmark structure. Overall, the ARC members were very supportive of the design and felt that the new structure would complement not only the waterfront but also the landmark structure very well. And only one item to share with you from the full Commission hearing is the Commission provided review and comment on the amendment to the Administrative Code for a process establishing cultural districts. As you know, this ordinance was passed by the Board of Supervisors a couple weeks ago. However, the Commission was not part of the review of this item before the full vote so the HPC requested the Department bring the ordinance to them for review and comment. Planning Department does have recommended amendments to make the program more inclusive and to reflect current practice between the Planning Department, the Mayor's Office of Housing and Work Force Development and Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development. And overall, we're very supportive of those amendments. Supervisor Ronen's office was in attendance, along with members of the public and MOHCD and MOEWD. And we will continue to work with Supervisor Ronen's office to see if they are amenable to those proposed amendments. So that concludes my presentation and my comments unless you have questions. Thank you.

**Commissioner Moore:**

I have a question for Mr. Sider please. Mr. Sider, the buildings you are referring to pre-Prop M, adapting to, in some cases housing, now being able to revert or recapture? There's a difference. As a subtlety here, revert means housing disappears, office moves in. Recapture meaning, using the amount of office space dedicated to housing and adding additional office space not counting against Prop M because I would think that would be a more conducive strategy because we do not want to lose housing.

**Dan Sider:**

Commissioner Moore, as we understand it, the ordinance would not result in a direct physical change to the environment in that fashion. This would simply recapture the square footage for Proposition M, accounting purposes, if you will.

**Commissioner Moore:**

That's great thank you so much. I'm glad you are saying that because, it wasn't clear from your talk about more like a building envelope, and here's office with housing and now it's going to go back to offices. Great idea. Thank you.

**D. GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT**

SPEAKERS: Georgia Schuttish – 317(b)(2)(D) Value adjustment

**E. REGULAR CALENDAR**

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

10. [2018-003260PCA](#) (A. BUTKUS: (415) 575-9129)  
PUBLIC PARKING LOTS AS A PERMITTED USE IN THE GLEN PARK NCT DISTRICT AND ADJOINING LOCATIONS – **Planning Code Amendment** to permit as of right Public Parking Lot uses where the parcel is located in both the Glen Park Neighborhood Commercial Transit and RH-2 (Residential, House Districts, Two-Family) zoning districts, the property has been used as Public Parking Lot for the past ten years without the benefit of a permit, and the adjoining RH-2 parcel is no larger than 40 feet by 110 feet; affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act; making findings of consistency with the General Plan, and the eight priority policies of Planning Code, Section 101.1; and making findings of public necessity, convenience, and welfare pursuant to Planning Code, Section 302.  
 (Continued from Regular hearing on May 3, 2018)  
*Preliminary Recommendation: Disapprove*

SPEAKERS: + Sharon Johnson, Aide to Sup. Sheehy – Parking lot  
 = Dan Sider – Staff report  
 - Mike Sherald – Opposed to the parking  
 - Steven Buss – Opposed to the parking

ACTION: Disapproved



AYES: Hillis, Johnson, Koppel, Melgar, Moore, Richards  
 ABSENT: Fong  
 RESOLUTION: 20197

11. [2018-004633PCA](#) (J. BINTLIFF: (415) 575-9170)  
**MAYOR'S PROCESS IMPROVEMENTS ORDINANCE [BOARD FILE NO. 180423] – Planning Code Amendment** to streamline affordable housing project review by eliminating a Planning Commission Discretionary Review hearing for 100% affordable housing projects upon delegation by the Planning Commission; to provide for Planning Department review of large projects located in C-3 Districts and for certain minor alterations to Historical Landmarks and in Conservation Districts; to consolidate, standardize and streamline notification requirements and procedures, including required newspaper notice, in Residential, Commercial, and Mixed-Use Districts; and affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act, making findings of consistency with the General Plan and the eight priority policies of Planning Code, Section 101.1, and adopting findings of public necessity, convenience, and welfare under Planning Code, Section 302.  
 (Continued from Regular hearing on May 24, 2018)  
*Preliminary Recommendation: Approve*

SPEAKERS: = Jacob Bintliff – Staff report  
 + Kanishka Karunaratne, Mayor's Office – Proposed amendments  
 + Patrick Donato – Support  
 + Ross Levy – Support  
 - Georgia Schuttish – Opposed  
 + Karen Payson – Support  
 + Lydia Tso – Support  
 + Neil Shwartz – Support  
 + Larry Badiner – Support  
 - Paul Barrera – Opposed, no outreach  
 + Christopher Roche – Support  
 = Cynthia Gomez  
 - Rose Hillson – Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods (CSFN) sees certain sections of the Mayor's Process Improvements Ordinance as concerning:

- Lacked community outreach in formulating legislation – lacked public participation
- Reduction of time period to respond to notifications
- Reduction of notification radius
- Elimination of newspaper notices
- Changes to noticing disenfranchises residents
- Good to add occupants to noticing for transparency
- Removal of Notification e.g. pop-outs into rear yards that extend into side and rear yards and up 2 stories, etc.
  - Serious impact to quiet enjoyment of property
  - Impacts from excavations & foundation installations
- Notifications for Sec. 136(c) items where bases of flagpoles, underground garages, retaining walls, e.g., potential excavation and foundation impacts

- Request Planning to outreach to neighborhoods for meaningful input before proceeding with legislation

Look at my 5-29-2018 letter in Supplements & 4-15-2018 "Housing Now" document (future plan).

- Gus Hernandez – Pre-application meetings
- David Woo - Opposition
- + Jack Burden – Support
- + Toby Levy – Support
- Speaker – Do not reduce the notification period to 20 days.
- Anastasia Yovonapolous – Opposed
- Carolyn Kennedy – Opposed to 20 day 311 notice and 12
- Catherine Howard – Opposed pop-out
- + David Gast – Support
- Stan Hayes – Public involvement
- + Lev Wiesbach – Disingenuous comments
- + James Hill – Support
- + Tim Collen – Support
- + Jeff Hodges – Support
- Speaker – Opposed
- = Jeremy Schaub – Separate processes
- + Kristy Wong – Support
- + Kevin Burke – DR
- + Jimmy – Streamline the process
- Teresa Flandricks
- Lisa Fromer – Collaborative
- Ozzie Rohm – Evictions
- Cathleen Courtney – Adversarial relationship
- + Speaker
- + Chevon
- + Laura Clarke – Housing
- + Steven Buss
- + Seas Kignan – 136(c)(2s) predictable timeline
- Sue Hestor – Outreach
- + Ron Miguel – Support
- + Norma Guzman – Support
- Speaker – Hardship over notices
- + Speaker – Support

ACTION: Approved as amended to include:

1. 30 day notification;
2. Implementation details to become effective after Commission Policy is adopted;
3. Review of procedures one year after it becomes effective;
4. Affordable housing projects to be built to SF Building Code standards and workers paid a SF prevailing wage;
5. Adhere to the affordable housing performance standards established by MOHCD; and
6. Retain notification for Section 136(c)(25) pop-outs.

AYES: Fong, Hillis, Johnson, Koppel, Melgar, Richards

AGAINST: Moore

RESOLUTION: 20198

12a. (M. BOUDREAUX: (415) 575-9140)

[ACCESSORY DWELLING UNIT \(ADU\) TRACKING AND MONITORING REPORT](#) – Pursuant to Ordinances adopted by the Board of Supervisors which created the ADU program and Sections 207.4(c)(4)(I) and (c)(6)(F) of the Planning Code require a tracking and monitoring report to be prepared for the Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) program. This is the first of such reports, and includes data since San Francisco's ADU legislation was first enacted in 2014 through the first quarter of 2018.

*Preliminary Recommendation: None - Informational*

SPEAKERS:

- = Marcelle Boudreaux – Staff presentation
- = Kimia Haddadan – Staff report
- + Menaka Mohan, Aide to Sup. Tang – Proposed amendments
- Michael Murphy – Failure to comply with state law
- = Georgia Schuttish – Affordability issue
- Rose Hillson – Street tree planting for ADU “fee-out” provision unclear. Amend to say: there **\*shall\*** be assurance that appropriate number of trees be planted within a reasonable amount of time (e.g. 90 days).
- Converting non-living space (e.g. garages, tool sheds, etc.) to living space causes impacts to enjoyment on neighbors’ properties. Amend code so neighbors **\*shall\*** be noticed for conversions.
- Fill-ins of existing structures (e.g. pop-outs) might not comply with code for rear/side setback areas. Amend legislation so they shall for these setback areas.
- Proposal to allow adding ADUs to a new building would result in number of Dwelling Units in that building exceeds code. Amend legislation so a new building proposal that proposes to add a unit above the count for the zone shall **\*not\*** be considered an ADU so total unit maximum meets code.
- For permitting unauthorized units: State: “Any existing ADUs **\*shall\*** meet building and fire code regulations.”

CSFN

- = Stan Hayes
- + Kristy Wong – Support
- + Dillon Casey – Support
- + Katherine Howard
- + Jeremy Schaub
- = Teresa Flandrick
- = Anastasia Yovonapolous
- Ozzie Rohm – Effectively up zoning
- + Jimmy – Excited
- + Dillion - Support

ACTION: None - Informational

12b. [2018-004194PCA](#) (K. HADDADAN: (415) 575-9068)  
[ACCESSORY DWELLING UNIT AMENDMENTS \[BOARD FILE NO. 180268\]](#) – Ordinance amending the **Planning Code** to authorize the Zoning Administrator to waive or modify

bicycle parking requirements for an Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU), allow more than one unauthorized unit constructed without a permit to be legalized, exempt from the permit notification requirement ADUs constructed within the defined existing built envelope, allow conversion of an existing stand-alone garage or storage structure to an ADU and expansion of the existing building envelope to add dormers, eliminate the street tree requirement for an ADU, and allow one ADU to be added to a new residential building of three units or less as a component of the new construction. It would also amend the Building Code to provide for a pre-application plan review for ADUs.

*Preliminary Recommendation: Approve with Modification*

SPEAKERS: Same as item 12a.

ACTION: After hearing and closing public comment; Continued to June 21, 2018

AYES: Fong, Hillis, Johnson, Koppel, Melgar, Moore, Richards

13. (S. GYGI: (415) 575-9194)

[RAIL ALIGNMENT AND BENEFITS \(RAB\) STUDY](#) – **Informational Presentation** - In 2014 the Planning Department began the Rail Alignment and Benefits (RAB) Study looking at five large transportation and land use questions in the southeast quadrant of the City. While each component is on a different timeline, understanding how they interact is essential as they will result in decisions that will affect San Francisco for more than 100 years. The first component (Rail Alignment to the Salesforce Transit Center) is the most time sensitive and City staff has identified a preliminary preferred alignment: Pennsylvania Avenue (DTX + Extended Tunnel). A public meeting was held on May 29, 2018 to discuss all information completed under the Study. This Informational Presentation will highlight the Study's findings and recommendations to the Commission.

*Preliminary Recommendation: None - Informational*

SPEAKERS: + Susan Gygi – Staff presentation

+ John Rahaim

+ Ron Miguel

+ Jim Haas

+ Sue Hestor

ACTION: None - Informational

14a. [2017-002943CRV](#) (A. HARRIS: (415) 575-9136)

[TDM PROGRAM FIRST-YEAR MONITORING REPORT](#) – Planning Code Section 169.6 requires the Planning Department to prepare a TDM Program report one year after the Program became effective, to analyze the implementation of the Program and discuss any amendments made to the Program Standards during that time. The report references information gathered between March 19, 2017 and March 18, 2018.

*Preliminary Recommendation: None – Informational*

SPEAKERS: = Audrey Harris – Staff presentation

+ Chloe Angelus – Biker share measures

+ Niko Danilus – Support

ACTION: None - Informational

14b. [2017-002943CRV](#) (A. HARRIS: (415) 575-9136)

AMENDMENTS TO THE TDM PROGRAM STANDARDS – Since the Program’s effective date of March 19, 2017, staff has conducted stakeholder in-reach and outreach to monitor the Program’s implementation and to identify potential amendments to the TDM Program Standards to help clarify and/or change the Program’s implementation. Based on this feedback, staff recommends that the Planning Commission adopt amendments to the TDM Program Standards, more specifically, amendments to measures related to improving walking conditions and bicycle parking.

*Preliminary Recommendation: Adopt Amendments*

SPEAKERS: Same as item 14a.

ACTION: Adopted

AYES: Fong, Hillis, Johnson, Koppel, Melgar, Moore, Richards

RESOLUTION: 20199

- 16a. [2016-007695CUA](#) (N. KWIATKOWSKA: (415) 575-9185)  
1420 HAMPSHIRE STREET – west side between 26<sup>th</sup> and Cesar Chavez Streets; Lot 001 of Assessor’s Block 4334 (District 9) - Request for **Conditional Use Authorization**, pursuant to Planning Code Sections 209.1 and 303, to allow an enlargement of an existing Institutional use (residential care facility; dba Residential Care Facility for the Elderly) in the RH-2 Zoning District. The project would establish a total of 89 beds for the residential care facility and would construct a two-story, vertical addition atop the existing one-story-over-basement building. In addition, the project would undertake exterior alterations and an interior remodel. The subject property is located within a RH-2 (Residential, House, Two-Family) Zoning District, Calle 24 Special Use District, and 40-X Height and Bulk District. This action constitutes the Approval Action for the project for the purposes of CEQA, pursuant to San Francisco Administrative Code Section [31.04\(h\)](#).

*Preliminary Recommendation: Approve with conditions*

SPEAKERS: = Natalia Kwiatkowska – Staff report  
 + Jeremy Schaub – Project presentation  
 + Tommy Lee – Project presentation  
 + Sue Hestor

ACTION: Approved with Conditions

AYES: Fong, Hillis, Johnson, Koppel, Melgar, Moore, Richards

MOTION: [20200](#)

- 16b. [2016-007695VAR](#) (N. KWIATKOWSKA: (415) 575-9185)  
1420 HAMPSHIRE STREET – west side between 26<sup>th</sup> and Cesar Chavez Streets; Lot 001 of Assessor’s Block 4334 (District 9) - **Request for Variance** from the front setback requirements pursuant to Planning Code Section 132, to allow a two-story, vertical addition atop the existing one-story-over-basement building. The subject property is located within a RH-2 (Residential, House, Two-Family) Zoning District, Calle 24 Special Use District, and 40-X Height and Bulk District.

SPEAKERS: Same as item 16a.

ACTION: ZA closed the PH and indicated an intent to Grant.

- 18a. [2017-010156DES](#) (F. MCMILLEN: (415) 575-9076)  
MINT-MISSION CONSERVATION DISTRICT – (Assessor’s Block 3704, Lots 003, 010, 012, 013,

015, 017, 018, 019, 020, 021, 022, 024, 028, 029, 034, 035, 059, 079, 113, 144; Assessor's Block 3725, Lots 087, 088) (District 4) – **Review and Comment** on the Designation of the Mint-Mission Conservation District as an Article 11 Conservation District pursuant to Section 1107 of the Planning Code. The district is bound by Stevenson Street to the north, Mint and 5<sup>th</sup> streets to the east, Mission and Minna streets to the south and 6<sup>th</sup> Street to the west. The Mint-Mission Conservation District encompasses a cohesive concentration of reinforced concrete and brick masonry buildings constructed between 1906 and 1930. The District retains a mix of residential hotels, small-scale commercial buildings, warehouses and manufacturing facilities reflective of the area's role as the center of industrial production in San Francisco and the major supplier of mining equipment, heavy machinery and other goods to the western states. The District is comprised of twenty-two properties, nineteen of which include contributing resources. The Mint Mission Conservation District is located in a C-3-G-Downtown General Zoning District and 90-X Height and Bulk District.  
(Continued from Regular hearing on May 10, 2018)

*Preliminary Recommendation: Review and Comment*

SPEAKERS: = Frances McMillen – Staff presentation  
 ACTION: Adopted a Recommendation for Approval  
 AYES: Fong, Hillis, Johnson, Koppel, Melgar, Moore, Richards  
 RESOLUTION: [20201](#)

- 18b. [2018-002775DES](#) (F. MCMILLEN: (415) 575-9076)  
KMMS CONSERVATION DISTRICT BOUNDARY CHANGE – (Assessor's Block 3705, Lots 021, 023, 039, 054) (District 4) – **Review and Comment** on a Change in the Boundary of the Kearny-Market-Mason-Sutter Conservation District to include 55 5<sup>th</sup> Street, Assessor's Block 3705 lot 039; 67-99 5<sup>th</sup> Street, Assessor's Block 3705 lots 021, 023; and 898 Mission Street, Assessor's Block 3705 lot 054 pursuant to Section 1107 of the Planning Code. The Kearny-Market-Mason-Sutter Conservation District is located in a C-3-G-Downtown General Zoning District and 90-X Height and Bulk District.

*Preliminary Recommendation: Review and Comment*

SPEAKERS: same as item 18a.  
 ACTION: Adopted a Recommendation for Approval  
 AYES: Fong, Hillis, Johnson, Koppel, Melgar, Moore, Richards  
 RESOLUTION: [20202](#)

- 18c. [2017-010250DES](#) (F. MCMILLEN: (415) 575-9076)  
CLYDE AND CROOKS WAREHOUSE HISTORIC DISTRICT – Assessor's Block 3787 Lots 005, 014, 015, 016, 037, 040A, 044, 048, 033, 151, 017, 021, 022, 019, 036, 040, 018, 013, 152-159 (District 9) – **Review and Comment** on the Landmark District Designation of the Clyde and Crooks Warehouse Historic District as an Article 10 Landmark District pursuant to Section 1004.1 of the Planning Code. The district is bound by Brannan Street to the north, Third Street to the east, Townsend Street to the south, and Lusk Street to the west. The Clyde and Crooks Warehouse Historic District is representative of 19<sup>th</sup> century development of the South of Market area as a center of industrial production in San Francisco and maritime commerce along the west coast. The district's mix of industrial and warehouse buildings interspersed with residential structures is typical of the land use patterns developed in the 19<sup>th</sup> century in the South of Market neighborhood and continued during the 1906 earthquake and fire reconstruction period. The buildings

exemplify early 20<sup>th</sup> century methods of construction and materials and the return of South of Market's function as the industrial center of the city following the earthquake and fire. The Clyde and Crooks Warehouse Historic District is located in a SLI – SOMA Service – Light Industrial Zoning District and 65-X Height and Bulk district.

*Preliminary Recommendation: Review and Comment*

SPEAKERS: same as item 18a.

ACTION: Adopted a Recommendation for Approval

AYES: Fong, Hillis, Johnson, Koppel, Melgar, Moore, Richards

RESOLUTION: [20203](#)

ADJOURNMENT - 8:26 PM

ADOPTED JUNE 21, 2018