

SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING COMMISSION

DRAFT – Meeting Minutes

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

Thursday, January 8, 2015

1:30 p.m.

Regular Meeting

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

THE MEETING WAS CALLED TO ORDER BY PRESIDENT WU AT 1:43 p.m.

STAFF IN ATTENDANCE: John Rahaim – Planning Director, Omar Masry, Kim Durandet, Marcelle Boudreaux, Rich Sucre, Britany Bendix, Menaka Mohan, Kearstin Dischinger, Erika Jackson, Michael Smith, Tina Chang, and Jonas P. Ionin – Commission Secretary

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. 2014.1393C (O. MASRY: (415) 575-9116)
1135 EVANS AVENUE - at the southwest corner of Evans Avenue and Middle Point Road, Lot 014 in Assessor's Block 4602A - Request for **Conditional Use Authorization** under Planning Code Sections 711.83 and 303 to modify an existing wireless telecommunications services (WTS) facility operated by Sprint. The modified macro WTS facility would allow three (3) additional panel antennas adjacent to three (3) existing panel antennas mounted to Pacific Gas & Electric transmission towers. Related electronic equipment would be located on the transmission towers, and an existing ground-mounted equipment area. The facility is proposed on a Location Preference 1 Site (Preferred Location; Co-Location with Verizon Wireless and T-Mobile) within 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 Section 31.04(h) of the San Francisco Administrative Code.

(Continued from Regular Meeting of December 11, 2014)
(Proposed for Continuance to January 22, 2015)

SPEAKERS: None
 ACTION: Continued to February 5, 2015
 AYES: Wu, Fong, Antonini, Hillis, Johnson, Moore, Richards

2. 2014.001033PCA (A. STARR: (415) 558-6362)
ADMINISTRATIVE AND PLANNING CODE AMENDMENT – AMENDING REGULATION OF SHORT-TERM RESIDENTIAL RENTALS AND ESTABLISHING FEE [BOARD FILE 141036] - **Amendment to the Administrative Code** to provide an exception for permanent residents to the prohibition on short-term residential rentals under certain conditions; to create procedures, including a registry administered by the Planning Department, for tracking short-term residential rentals and compliance; to establish an application fee for the registry; amending the Planning Code to clarify that short-term residential rentals shall not change a unit's type as residential; affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act; and making findings of consistency with the General Plan and the eight priority policies of Planning Code Section 101.1.
 Preliminary Recommendation: Adopt a Recommendation for Approval
(Proposed for Continuance to March 5, 2015)

SPEAKERS: None
 ACTION: Continued to March 5, 2015
 AYES: Wu, Fong, Antonini, Hillis, Johnson, Moore, Richards

B. CONSENT CALENDAR

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

- 3a. [2011.1374E](#) (R. SUCRÉ: (415) 575-9108)
800 INDIANA STREET - located on the west side of Indiana Street between 20th and 22nd Streets, Lot 009 in Assessor's Block 4105 – Adoption of the **CEQA Findings** for the proposed project, including the new construction of a five-story, residential building (measuring approximately 58-feet high and approximately 431,020 gsf) with up to 326 dwelling units, 260 off-street parking spaces, 195 Class 1 bicycle parking spaces, 16 Class 2 bicycle parking spaces, and private and common open space within the UMU (Urban Mixed Use) Zoning District and 58-X Height and Bulk District.
 Preliminary Recommendation: Adopt CEQA Findings
 (Continued from Regular Meeting of December 18, 2014)
NOTE: After Hearing and Closing Public Comment; adopted a Motion of Intent to Approve with Conditions, including the Project Sponsor continue working with staff on the freeway side façade; and Continued to the January 8, 2015 Consent Calendar by a vote of +7 -0.

SPEAKERS: None
 ACTION: Adopted CEQA Findings

AYES: Wu, Fong, Antonini, Hillis, Johnson, Moore, Richards
 MOTION: 19303

- 3b. [2011.1374KX](#) (R. SUCRÉ: (415) 575-9108)
800 INDIANA STREET - located on the west side of Indiana Street between 20th and 22nd Streets, Lot 009 in Assessor's Block 4105 – Request for **Adoption of Findings**, pursuant to Planning Code Section 295, regarding the shadow study that concluded the new construction of a five-story, 58-ft tall, residential building with up to 326 dwelling units would not be adverse to the use of Esprit Park, which is under the jurisdiction of the San Francisco Recreation and Park Commission. The subject property is located within the UMU (Urban Mixed-Use Zoning District) and 58-X Height and Bulk District.
 Preliminary Recommendation: Adopt Findings
 (Continued from Regular Meeting of December 18, 2014)
NOTE: After Hearing and Closing Public Comment; adopted a Motion of Intent to Approve with Conditions, including the Project Sponsor continue working with staff on the freeway side façade; and Continued to the January 8, 2015 Consent Calendar by a vote of +7 -0.

SPEAKERS: None
 ACTION: Adopted Shadow Findings
 AYES: Wu, Fong, Antonini, Hillis, Johnson, Moore, Richards
 MOTION: 19304

- 3c. [2011.1374KX](#) (R. SUCRÉ: (415) 575-9108)
800 INDIANA STREET - located on the west side of Indiana Street between 20th and 22nd Streets, Lot 009 in Assessor's Block 4105 – Request for a **Large Project Authorization (LPA)**, pursuant to Planning Code Section 329, for the new construction of a five-story, residential building (measuring approximately 58-feet high and approximately 431,020 gsf) with up to 326 dwelling units, 260 off-street parking spaces, 195 Class 1 bicycle parking spaces, 16 Class 2 bicycle parking spaces, and private and common open space. Under the LPA, the project is seeking a modification to certain Planning Code requirements, including: 1) rear yard (Planning Code Section 134); 2) open space (Planning Code Section 135); 3) permitted obstructions over the street, setback, yard or useable open space (Planning Code Section 136); 4) dwelling unit exposure (Planning Code Section 140); 5) off-street loading (Planning Code Section 152.1); and, 6) horizontal mass reduction (Planning Code Section 270.1). The subject property is located within the UMU (Urban Mixed-Use Zoning District) and 58-X Height and Bulk District.
 Preliminary Recommendation: Approve with Conditions
 (Continued from Regular Meeting of December 18, 2014)
NOTE: After Hearing and Closing Public Comment; adopted a Motion of Intent to Approve with Conditions, including the Project Sponsor continue working with staff on the freeway side façade; and Continued to the January 8, 2015 Consent Calendar by a vote of +7 -0.

SPEAKERS: None
 ACTION: Approved with Conditions, including the Project Sponsor continue working with staff on the freeway side facade
 AYES: Wu, Fong, Antonini, Hillis, Johnson, Moore, Richards
 MOTION: 19305

4. [2014.0560C](#) (O. MASRY: (415) 575-9116)

4377 MISSION STREET - at the southeast corner of Mission Street and Avalon Avenue, Lots 033-041 in Assessor's Block 6013 - Request for **Conditional Use Authorization** under Planning Code Sections 745.83 and 303 to modify an existing wireless telecommunications services (WTS) facility operated by Sprint. The modified macro WTS facility would replace three (3) panel antennas which are mounted within a single rooftop-mounted radome; with six (6) panel antennas within a faux rooftop-mounted stairwell penthouse. Related electronic equipment would be located on the roof, and an existing first floor equipment area. The facility is proposed on a Location Preference 6 Site (Limited Preference, Individual Neighborhood Commercial District) within the Excelsior Outer Mission Street Neighborhood Commercial District, Excelsior Alcohol Restricted Use District, Fringe Financial Services Restricted 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 Section 31.04(h) of the San Francisco Administrative Code.

Preliminary Recommendation: Approve with Conditions

SPEAKERS: None

ACTION: Approved with Conditions

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

MOTION: 19306

5. [2014.1547C](#) (K. DURANDET: (415) 575-6816)
3481 18TH STREET - south side between Valencia and Lexington; Lot 145 of Assessor's Block 3589 - Request for **Conditional Use Authorization**, pursuant to Planning Code Sections 178(c), 186 and 303, to extend the hours of operation of an existing Limited Commercial Use authorized as a full-service restaurant (d.b.a. Regalito) within the RTO-Mission (Residential, Transit Oriented-Mission Neighborhood) Zoning District, Mission Alcoholic Beverage Special Use Sub-District and 55-X Height and Bulk District. This action constitutes the Approval Action for the project for the purposes of CEQA, pursuant to Section 31.04(h) of the San Francisco Administrative Code.

Preliminary Recommendation: Approve with Conditions

SPEAKERS: None

ACTION: Approved with Conditions

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

MOTION: 19307

6. [2014.0953C](#) (M. BOUDREAUX: (415) 575-9140)
498 SANCHEZ STREET - cross street 18th; Lot 087 in Assessor's Block 3581 - Request for **Conditional Use Authorization**, pursuant to Planning Code Section 182, 186, 303, 715.44, 721.44, 733.44, to allow change of use from Limited Restaurant to Restaurant (d.b.a. Samovar Tea Lounge) in conjunction with obtaining an ABC Type 41 license for on-sale beer and wine at the restaurant, within a RH-3 (Residential, House, Three-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 Section 31.04(h) of the San Francisco Administrative Code.

Preliminary Recommendation: Approve with Conditions

SPEAKERS: None

ACTION: Approved with Conditions

AYES: Wu, Fong, Antonini, Hillis, Johnson, Moore, Richards
 MOTION: 19308

7. [2014.1468Q](#) (B.BENDIX: (415) 575-9114)
178-188 ALBION STREET – west side of Albion Street between Camp and 17th Streets, Lot 035 in Assessor’s Block 3568; Request for **Condominium Conversion Subdivision** to convert a three-story-over-garage, six unit building into residential condominiums within an RTO-M (Residential, Transit Oriented – Mission) Zoning District and 45-X Height and Bulk District. This action constitutes the Approval Action for the project for the purposes of CEQA, pursuant to Section 31.04(h) of the San Francisco Administrative Code.
 Preliminary Recommendation: Approve

SPEAKERS: None
 ACTION: Approved
 AYES: Wu, Fong, Antonini, Hillis, Johnson, Moore, Richards
 MOTION: 19309

C. COMMISSION MATTERS

8. Consideration of Adoption:
- Draft Minutes for December 11, 2014
 - Draft Minutes for December 18, 2014

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

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

Commissioner Moore:

I wanted to raise a question that during the holidays, we received a letter from City Attorney Herrera, addressing the issue of the Academy of Art and while 2 1/2 years ago we received a similar letter under privileged and confidential, this letter is in the public and I would like to ask the Commission that we schedule a special meeting in order to discuss among ourselves, what the issues are and how we are best advised to go about it. I think given the exceptional length of this particular incident, the pile of incidents, I think we have come to the point we need to more actively pursue to what our true responsibilities are and I’m seeing that with a clear understanding that we are being considered as complacent and that is of great concern to me and I could not be speaking for more personal experience when I have to share with you as hard as it is for me. Last Saturday, I was about 8 miles into the Golden Gate Recreation Area in a completely off the track, off the grid location, not looking at all recognizable, as you know when my face when it appears on public comment or commissioner comments, and I was stopped in the middle of the trail and somebody addressed me as Commissioner Moore. And on Saturdays and Sundays and for the rest

of the week I'm not Commissioner Moore, I am just Kathrin Moore, and this person said to me, "How about the Academy of Art? You guys are not doing your job," and that's as far as I would like to take it. I ask for your support for scheduling this meeting, President Wu, and other Commissioners that, we get a discussion going where we are updated of what we need to do.

Commissioner Wu:

Director Rahaim and I and Commissioner Fong, we spoke about it earlier this week, so originally you wanted to address it during Director's Comments, but maybe now would be appropriate.

Director Rahaim:

I appreciate that and I wanted to give you an update of where we are and I think there's a misunderstanding frankly where we are as a result of that letter. So just as background, in April the Zoning Administrator issued the withdrawal of the notice of stay, in another words, he previously has issued a notice of violation, and put a stay on them, and stated that the appeal periods were no longer be told and penalties would begin accruing on November 2nd if the EIR was not published. The reason for that if you recall, there had not been progress in the EIR for about a year before that due for what we believe were substantial delays caused by the Academy. The goal of that notice -- that NOV at that time, was to create a situation where the Academy would be incentivized, if you will, to move ahead with the EIR. In the last 8 months, in fact that has happened, their EIR is 95 percent complete, and in consultation with the Zoning Administrator we agreed that it would not be productive at this point in the process to issue the notices. In fact, the Draft EIR will be issued next month and you will have a public hearing on the Draft EIR in March. As I said we're about 95 percent complete with the EIR and the Academy has in fact with new consultants has been working diligently with us, which is in fact a change, from had been the case before that point. I also want to say that I think there's been a number of actions that have happened since then. There were two properties that the ZA originally said they could not be legalized, one at 2295 Taylor and one at 740 Taylor, those properties have gone through a process. They appeal those decisions. In the case of 740 Taylor, they showed evidence that building could be occupied and the ZA agreed with that. In the case of the 2295 Taylor, they have reduced the size of their presence in that building, which means it could be legalized in the future, after the EIR is adopted. And they also vacated property that was part of the violation notices at 631 Howard Street, and there have been a number of ZA hearings that have happened where they have appealed his decisions and then they withdrew those appeals after the hearing, and did not contest the notice of violation. So the point being they started the process, their own process of contesting the notices and withdrew the objections, if you will, and we have confirmed that they had vacated portions of the building on 2290 Taylor so that building could be legalized. The other thing that's important, I think, the appeal of the Withdrawal of Notice of Stay, if you will, is pending at the Board of Appeals, still. That is one thing they haven't withdrawn and the Department is currently preparing Notice of Violation Penalty Decisions for the 20 properties that were previously subject to that stay, so we anticipate that those decisions would be issued after the completion of the Draft EIR with new penalty terms that will proceed at that point. So the bottom line for us is that the EIR is 95 percent complete. We have felt that -- the ZA felt it wouldn't be productive at this point to issue penalties when we are that close and we will be issuing the Draft EIR next month.

Commissioner Wu:

Thank you and we will be scheduling a hearing.

Commissioner Antonini:

Thank you. I'd like to speak for a moment first of all, I want to wish everyone a Happy New Year but I want to speak for a moment about an article that appeared in this Tuesday's Chronicle on the front page, authored by J. K. Dineen, entitled "Growing Controversy," and unfortunately, there were blatantly remarks of mine, they were accurate remarks, but they were taken out of context. There is a picture that was on the Chronicle front page, and because these remarks were placed with that picture in an article about the developments in Corona Heights, the public was led to

believe that my remarks for speaking in favor of this, of what appear to be one monster home. Actually, I was very fortunate to be helped by staff today and given this exact information about, actually Tina Chang sent me those renderings that show it's not one structure, it is actually four different structures two of which have their entrances on Museum, two of which have their entrances on State Street, and this was not approved by the Planning Commission. In fact, immediately after the article came out, my wife, among others immediately said, "Why did you guys approve that thing? It's horrible, it's massive." Well, we found out it was never approved by Planning, because it was private property, there was no demolition, the heights of all the structures are under 40 feet and there was no DR filed by any of the people in the area, or anyone, anyplace in the City, so it didn't come before us. It was approved administratively. In fact, they are still large structures, the ones on Museum are probably over 3,000 sq. ft., the ones on State are probably under 2,000 sq. ft., but they are four separate single-family homes. So that's is the reason, you kind of -- what you see is not always what you get, so, it is very easy to judging from the picture in the Chronicle, think it's one structure and it is not, it's four separate structures. They are large, but most of what you see is the ones on Museum coming down the hill, and it is not six levels as presented only four levels on Museum and probably two levels on State Street. Then also in regards to the remarks he attributed; the remarks are accurate, but they were taken out of context. I was not speaking about the fact you need to have huge houses to accommodate families with children. There are many families who live in crowded conditions who would be very happy to have a home of 1,000 or 1,200 sq. ft. even if they had multiple children, that was clean and safe and we have to work on that, we're considering the Housing Element later on today, but what I was speaking to is the fact that we have a scarcity of three bedroom homes in San Francisco, only 22 percent are three bedrooms or more and there -- we are building a tiny number of new family homes in San Francisco and there is a significant demographic of young -- or of all ages business and professional people with children who are making decisions every day, whether they are going to raise their families in San Francisco or move to the Peninsula, Marin or the East Bay and oftentimes one of the big factors in addition to cost is what's available out there, and oftentimes the older homes need a lot of work in addition to the huge price they pay for those there is another huge price to bring up of them up to the standards they need for a family today, and I see this in my generation and my children's generation, so the needs of people are becoming larger for homes because we have many multi-generational families as we hear about often, we have a lot of people nowadays that work from within their homes or at least part of the time require a home office in a separate room to be able to keep their business affairs separate from the rest of the family, but as Mr. Dineen said accurately I did not say people need to have large homes, I said if you choose to have a large home, it's going to be expensive, and I said I'm sorry, it's this way. We have a very desirable place, if anything, not building new homes of all sizes even some that are a little bit larger exacerbates the problem because those families choose to have homes that are that 2,000 or more sq. ft., are just going to compete with each other for the existing stock. I think a letter to the editor talked about the fact, critical of my remark, said for 150 years we've been able to meet our housing needs in San Francisco. For many of those years we had enough land where private builders without any different things, any incentives from the City, but a lot met those needs by building new homes for all income levels in the Sunset, in the Outer Mission, in the Richmond, and all parts of San Francisco eventually the area around Twin Peaks. So, we have to find a way to incentivize the construction of more single family homes in the City, because there is demand for those, and if we don't do it, one of two things will happen more people with families who are productive members of our society and often have enough discretionary time to contribute to philanthropic ventures, or coach children, it's good to have these people here if we can keep them here. And many of the Commissioners said even if you build large home you can't guarantee they are going to be occupied by families, and your are right about that, it could somebody, a couple just want a huge home, but doesn't have any children, but if you don't build the homes, you can more or less guarantee that there are going to be more families that have the desire for moderate to large homes to leave San Francisco or drive up the prices of those that still exist. Another thing that sometimes is deceptive when we discussed this whole issue of housing size, years ago maybe even today, people measure square footage you don't count bathrooms, you do not count hall, you

don't count the garage, or don't even count downstairs rooms that are semi- improved. So, a house from years past that legally as listed as a certain square footage and then today's new home often is listed gross square footage which includes many of the same things so you have to kind of compare apples and apples as to what the real size of these homes are. But, I think that I just wanted to clear the air a little bit about that and I'm very much in sympathy with people that want to help keep families here and want produce income at all levels it doesn't mean we only need to only concentrate on large homes, but there's a place for those and if they are appropriate to the neighborhood that they're build in, and they don't have adverse effects on them, I think they serve a good purpose.

Commissioner Richards:

I have a fairly long thing that I'd like to say, I have done a lot of thinking over the last three weeks, a lot of this, I've received a lot of feedback, specifically on some of the things that were on the press, as well I think, picking up on some of things we talked about it in terms of the role of this body and the policy things we were struggling with on where exactly do we fit in? Where is it that we don't fit in? The first thing I thought of was, if this were a private company, I take the Planning Commission is the independent board of directors, we would set policy and direction for the company with advice, obviously of the experts in the organization, we approve initiative and projects, we do that when we approve specific projects and then we also decide conflicts, that would be called our DR role. In a private industry, supporting actions on setting policy and direction would be having in this body a strategy committee, compensation committee, which also does performance evaluations, an audit committee, do we -- are we functioning, the way we say we are functioning? Good example would be the letter we received from the City Attorney, governance committee and then legal and regulatory. The supporting actions for board of directors approving issues in projects, is that they approved budgets, they also have a line item spending authority to a certain level to make sure that nothing it is going amiss and actually supports the strategy that they set, and they also hire and fire the CEO. They also do have decisions in conflict, and those are few and far between because things get to the board of directors in a private company that are conflicts, really means that is something completely wrong in the organization. I think for this organization, policy and direction, the only thing that I have seen so far concrete that really lays out what our policy role is in deciding what the Prop M Large Cap Office Allocation criteria is going to be, that's the only explicit thing that I've seen in my five months. I think we're trying to set up a policy and direction on the patterns of decision making that we've made; however, as I look back, we are not always consistent, so we can't rely on our decision making to say we're setting policies by your decisions, because they are not always the same. I view the role of the Director is the CEO of the organization. He manages the organization, this is in an industry analogy, this will probably be 80-90 percent overlay, there is always going to be some differences. Sets policies and actions and delivers results, operation responsible, fiscally responsible, sets strategy and delivering on the frame of the policy that we developed in conjunction with you, and the City Attorney, the Ethics Commission, what I would call the FCC in my the example and then the ultimate authority out there, which really woke me up this week was, the ballot box planning article that actually Art Agnos wrote that says, "Hey! We're going to keep on doing ballot box planning because we are losing faith in you." The voters are the ultimate shareholders for our company. We've had several ballot box plannings in the last couple elections, you know, 8 Washington, Prop B on the heights. We had several people here in last couple meetings get up and threaten right in front of us, that they're going to initiate ballot box planning for us, I've heard them, the site program was one of them, 5M could be one of them, certainly the Flower Mart is coming up, so I think we need to listen sometimes to the shareholders as well. Now, I think in our organization here, our rule in setting policy hasn't been optimized. I think sometimes we might have it a bit backwards and I think it's a result from the feedback I received and the letters I received and the people, who actually I'm tired of running into on the street, they're losing trust in us and they are losing faith that we can be fair and we can be impartial when we have everybody's best interest at heart. A couple of items from a policy point of view that I struggle with are, what takes priority over what, especially, when we have a choice: housing, office, PDR space.

We have a project coming up where by right they can have an office but if don't give the allocation, it stays PDR. What's our policy on that? Is it what we feel today? Shouldn't we be setting some type of policy so people understand? They shouldn't be out buying spaces knowing that they going to turn them into offices if we don't want that to happen. I think the other thing is affordable housing versus luxury housing, what is family housing? What takes precedence, rent controlled units over the for sale units? We had issue over at 26th and Clement, which the Board overturned our decision. The enforcement approach, I think we need a little bit more stick than carrot. I think, as I mentioned in my last Commission comments, we have way too – I'm receiving way too much feedback that enforcement is being taken as kind of a cost of doing business, and it's encouraging the kind of behavior we don't want, and I think that this Commission needs to take a larger role in some leadership and having some bigger decisions, and especially around governments and how to set policy, rules, what are the rules we propose to be changed? I was a bit surprised that the rules, I thought we could be adding a lot more in there to help. I think we need to address the issues and I think it's critical given everything that's happening in the City now. I don't want to be at the end of my term or after, have people come back to me and say, "Where was the Planning Commission when all of this stuff was happening?" So I want to make sure that I go on record as saying, I think we need to play a larger role. I support special session around the governance, rules and other things like that, thank you.

Commissioner Fong:

Well I don't want to turn it into a discussion, but I appreciate the amount of thought you have spent over the holidays. I think that five to six months is an interesting observation. I think it's tempting and easy to try to compare it to other organizations. It is comparable to some degree and I agree with many of the point you brought up. It is also a little bit more free flowing and changing with the winds as the City grows and shrinks and maybe some of the danger of the setting firm policy is that as the City changes you may need to have reactive measures to counter measure events that occur. That said, that can be done and that can be written into new policies and procedures with really sort of a long term goal. I share the same thought that the large visionary direction of San Francisco, that this organization, this Department, plays a significant role. I think we're doing a great job. San Francisco is on top of the game right now, but it can always be better, there is room for improvement and I'd be interested in carrying on that conversation, if you don't mind sharing your notes with me or the rest of the Commission, I think it would be helpful.

Commissioner Johnson:

I would also again in an effort to not make this discussion today but in the future, I would also like to continue the conversation, also with the vein of how can we increase our collaboration with other departments and divisions because I totally agree with you, in everything basically you said about us setting vision and really having reasoning behind out policies, not that it can't change in the future and there are certain even example elements that you gave that you're never going to get all seven to agree on, but I think that the problem is the devil is in the details. You can say whatever you want, but the implementation is what matters and there are a lot of programs and at lot of activities that are not the Planning Department that the Planning Commission opines on in terms of policy and if we have no connection to those other offices whether they be in the Mayor's Office or other departments or agencies, then our vision doesn't really go past our hearings, so I'd like to have the discussion also be around, we had a little bit today is actually an item were we talked about interdepartmental plan implementation, but to really get more into that, like what is our collaboration and how does our vision extend and sort of mix with the vision of other departments and agencies?

Commissioner Wu:

Thank you, so Commissioner Fong and I will definitely follow-up with Director Rahaim and Mr. Ionin. I think that there's a start next week with the proposed Citywide Work Plan. Mr. Kelly has alluded to try to set department wide policy through that work plan. Another opportunity, I believe, is through the informational hearings that we do have. Commissioner Johnson you

pointed out that we're hearing about the IPIC later in today's hearing. I think that may be some intentionality towards scheduling consecutive informational hearings that topically have to do with one another may help us create a forum to talk about some of the issues that have been raised.

10. [Commission Rules & Regulations](#) - Consideration of Amendments and Adoption.

SPEAKERS: Sue Hestor – Changing rules to the detriment of the public, continuance
 Bob Planthold – Continuance, no adequate notice
 Rose Hilson – Continuance
 Erik Brooks – Continuance
 Dr. Espanola Jackson – Continuance
 Hiroshi Fukuda – Continuance
 Shirley Moore – Continuance
 Kathy Devincenzi – Deadlines
 John Bardis - Postponement

ACTION: Continued to February 5, 2015

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

D. DEPARTMENT MATTERS

11. Director's Announcements

Director Rahaim:

Commissioners, the only item I want to bring up today was that we are -- regarding the Sunnydale EIR, which has been issued for the SF Hope Project, the Sunnydale Project, your hearing on this project on the EIR will be on January 22nd. I just want to let you and the public know we're also having on site hearing, the staff will conduct to receive comments on the Draft EIR, which will happen two days before that on January 20th at 5:00 p.m. on-site at Sunnydale and post the specifics of the address on our website, but before your hearing we wanted to make sure we get to the site to receive public comments on the EIR as well as the official hearing, which happens here at the Commission on the 22nd, so again that will be on January 20th at 5:00 p.m. on-site at Sunnydale. Thank you.

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

E. GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT – 15 MINUTES

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

SPEAKERS: Bob Planthold – Short-term rentals
 Dino Adelfio – Outside the box analogies, 140 calories
 Dr. Espanola Jackson – Social security and medical information
 Shirley Moore – Candlestick Park implosion
 (F) Speaker – Candlestick Park implosion
 Ebony Eister – Candlestick Park implosion

Dr. Tompkins – Addendums, environmental justice

F. REGULAR CALENDAR

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

13. (K. DISCHINGER: (415) 558-6284)
[AREA PLAN IMPLEMENTATION UPDATE AND INTER-DEPARTMENT PLAN IMPLEMENTATION COMMITTEE \(IPIC\) REPORT](#) - **Informational presentation** on the activities of the Department's Plan Implementation Group, including overview of progress toward funding infrastructure projects called for in adopted area plans and coordination with CACs. Presentation of 2014 Inter-Department Plan Implementation Committee (IPIC) Report, which includes capital planning accomplishments and recommendations for each plan area.

Preliminary Recommendation: None - Informational

SPEAKERS: - Dr. Espanola Jackson – Who's getting the \$\$
 = John Elberling – Childcare
 = Diana Martinez –
 Ebony Eister – Park open space

ACTION: None – Informational

14. [2014.001503CWP](#) (M. MOHAN: (415) 575-9141)
2014 HOUSING ELEMENT UPDATE - Consideration of a Resolution to **Initiate Amendments to the San Francisco General Plan**. Pursuant to San Francisco Charter Section 4.105, Planning Code Section 340(c), consideration of a Resolution of intention to initiate an amendment to the General Plan, including repealing the existing Housing Element of the General Plan, adopting the 2014 Housing Element update, and related actions, making Planning Code Section 101.1 findings, and recommending that the Board of Supervisors adopt an Ordinance approving the amendments. The 2014 Housing Element Update is required by State Law, and includes Part 1: Data and Needs Analysis, which contains a description and analysis of San Francisco's population, household and employment trends, existing housing characteristics, and housing needs; Part 2: Objectives, Policies; and a series of Appendices including Implementing Programs, which sets forth actions to help address the City's needs.

Preliminary Recommendation: Adopt a Resolution to Initiate and Adoption Proceedings

SPEAKERS: = Bob Planthold – Screen reader software, disability
 - Dr. Espanola Jackson – Community outreach
 = Nancyh Levins – Neighborhood organizations as key stakeholders
 - Diana Martinez – No luxury condos, affordable housing
 + Tim Colen – Modest document
 = (M) Speaker – Housing crisis, homeless, purchasing power
 - Kathy DeVincenzi – More time
 - Erik Brooks – More aggressive guiding document
 - Hiroshi Fukuda – Not meeting our goals, reflect present needs

- Sue Hestor – AirBnB, inadequate data
 - Rose Hilson – Heavy hitting document
 - John Bardis – More review time
 - Greg Scott – Poor process, excluded neighborhood representatives
- ACTION: Initiated and set February 5, 2015 as the possible adoption date, assuming the CEQA Addendum is issued two weeks in advance.

AYES: Fong, Antonini, Hillis, Johnson, Moore, Richards
 ABSENT: Wu
 MOTION: 19310

15. [2013.1600B](#) (E. JACKSON: (415) 558-6363)
340 BRYANT STREET - at Rincon Alley, Lot 061 in Assessor's Block 3764, Request for **Office Development Authorization**, pursuant to Planning Code Sections 321 and 842.66 to convert the second, third and fourth floors to 47,536 gross square feet of office use. The subject property is located within the Mixed Use Office (MUO) Zoning District and 65-X Height and Bulk District. This action constitutes the Approval Action for the project for the purposes of CEQA, pursuant to Section 31.04(h) of the San Francisco Administrative Code. Preliminary Recommendation: Approve with Conditions

SPEAKERS: + John Kevlin – Project presentation
 + Jim Heron – Support
 - Sue Hestor – Continuance request
 + John Elberling – Subsidy for art spaces
 + Alice Rogers – Ground floor PDR
 - Jim Meko – Outreach

ACTION: Approved with Conditions as amended, including the ground floor be retained as PDR with Findings supporting said condition; and Findings that the TMP include pedestrian safety and traffic calming measures.

AYES: Fong, Antonini, Hillis, Johnson, Moore, Richards
 ABSENT: Wu
 MOTION: 19311

G. DISCRETIONARY REVIEW CALENDAR

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

16. [2014.0177DD](#) (T. CHANG: (415) 575-9197)
53 STATES STREET - south side of States Street between Castro and Douglass Streets; Lot 074 in Assessor's Block 6623 - **Mandatory Discretionary Review**, pursuant to Planning Code Section 317, to demolish an existing single-family dwelling unit to construct a new four-story, two-family dwelling within a RH-2 (Residential, Home, Two-Family) Zoning District and 40-X Height and Bulk District. This action constitutes the Approval Action for the project for purposes of CEQA, pursuant to Section 31.04(h) of the San Francisco Administrative Code. Preliminary Recommendation: Do Not Take Discretionary Review and Approve

(Continued from Regular Meeting of November 20, 2014)

NOTE: After Hearing and Closing Public Comment, provided direction on bulk and scale; and Continued to January 8, 2015 by a vote of +7 -0.

SPEAKERS: + John Lum – Project presentation
 - Henry Eissler – Street character
 - Roxanna Altos – Affordable housing
 - Hector Martinez – Redesign does not do enough
 - Chris Parks – Affordable housing
 - Judith Hoyem – Affordable housing
 - Steve Zeltzer – Affordable housing, senior planning staff

ACTION: No DR, Approved as modified

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

ABSENT: Wu

DRA No: 0399

17. [2012.0588DD](#) (M. SMITH: (415) 558-6332)
987-991 DOLORES STREET – east side of Dolores Street between 22nd and 23rd Streets; Lot 017 in Assessor's Block 3631 – Requests for **Discretionary Review** of building permit No. 2014.05.06.4989, proposing to demolish the existing detached garage located at the rear of the property on Quane Street and construct a detached, one-story over garage dwelling in the same location. One of the dwellings from the front building on Dolores Street would be relocated to the proposed detached building. The total number of dwellings on the lot would remain six dwellings. In February 2014, the project was granted variances for exposure, rear yard, and parking pursuant to case No. 2013.0588V. The subject property is located within a RM-1 (Residential, Mixed, Moderate-Density) Zoning District and 40-X Height and Bulk District. This action constitutes the Approval Action for the project for purposes of CEQA, pursuant to Section 31.04(h) of the San Francisco Administrative Code. Preliminary Recommendation: Do Not Take Discretionary Review and Approve
WITHDRAWN
18. [2014.0065D](#) (M. SMITH: (415) 558-6332)
3721 21ST STREET – south side of 21st Street between Noe and Sanchez Streets; Lot 081 in Assessor's Block 3621 – Request for **Discretionary Review** of building permit No. 2013.12.13.4205, proposing to construct a three-story over garage, single-family dwelling. Pursuant to Section 317 of the Code, the proposed demolition of the existing building was administratively approved pursuant to case No. 2013.0067D because it has a value greater than at least 80% of the combined land and structure values of single-family homes in San Francisco. The subject property is located within a RH-1 (Residential, House, One-Family) Zoning District, the Dolores Heights Special Use District, and 40-X Height and Bulk District. This action constitutes the Approval Action for the project for purposes of CEQA, pursuant to Section 31.04(h) of the San Francisco Administrative Code. Preliminary Recommendation: Do Not Take Discretionary Review and Approve
WITHDRAWN

H. PUBLIC COMMENT

At this time, members of the public may address the Commission on items of interest to the public that are within the subject matter jurisdiction of the Commission except agenda items. With

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

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

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

SPEAKERS: John Tallefiero – Stadiums, tax incentives
 Dr. Tompkins – Candlestick implosion
 Erik Brooks – Candlestick implosion, calendared before the CPC
 Steve Zeltzer – Candlestick implosion
 Rose Hillson – Geology issues at Candlestick
 Dino Adelfio

ADJOURNMENT - 7:13 PM