

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 5, 2017
12:00 p.m.
Regular Meeting

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Fong, Richards, Koppel, Melgar Moore
COMMISSIONERS ABSENT: Hills, Johnson

THE MEETING WAS CALLED TO ORDER BY PRESIDENT FONG AT 12:15 P.M.

STAFF IN ATTENDANCE: John Rahaim – Planning Director, Michael Jacinto, Diego Sanchez, Jonathan DiSalvo, Doug Vu, Delvin Washington, Jeffrey Speirs, Christopher Thomas, and Jonas P. Ionin – Commission Secretary

SPEAKER KEY:

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

A. CONSIDERATION OF ITEMS PROPOSED FOR CONTINUANCE

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

1. 2014-0936DRP (E. JARDINES: (415) 575-9144)
590 LELAND AVENUE - located on the north side of Leland Avenue and west of Hahn Street; Lots: 061, 062, 063, 064, 065 in Assessor's Block 6243 (District 10) - Request for **Discretionary Review** of Building Permit Application No. 2014.06.06.7762, proposing the demolition of an existing church and construction of five new three-story, single-family homes (addressed as 579, 583, and 589 Raymond Avenue, and 586 and 590 Leland Avenue). The Project is located within a RH-1 (Residential, House, One-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.

Staff Analysis: Full Analysis Discretionary Review

Preliminary Recommendation: Do Not Take Discretionary Review and Approve as Revised
(Proposed for Continuance to January 12, 2017)

SPEAKERS: None
 ACTION: Continued to January 12, 2017
 AYES: Fong, Richards, Koppel, Melgar, Moore
 ABSENT: Hillis, Johnson

2. 2016-00613CUA (E. JARDINES: (415) 575-9144)
1245 ALABAMA STREET – located on the east side of Alabama Street between 24th and 25th Streets; Lot 027 and in Assessor's Block 4269 (District 9) – Request for **Conditional Use Authorization**, pursuant to Planning Code Sections 209.1, 303 and 317, to allow the expansion of a child-care facility (DBA Mission Neighborhood Centers) and allow the change of use and residential conversion from the vacant St. Peter's Convent (group housing) to a community facility (DBA Mission Neighborhood Centers) on the second floor of an existing two-story building. The subject property is within a RH-2 (Residential House-Two Family) and 40-X Height and Bulk Districts. 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: Approve with Conditions
(Proposed for Continuance to January 26, 2017)

SPEAKERS: None
 ACTION: Continued to January 26, 2017
 AYES: Fong, Richards, Koppel, Melgar, Moore
 ABSENT: Hillis, Johnson

B. COMMISSION MATTERS

3. Consideration of Adoption:
- [Draft Minutes for December 8, 2016](#)
[Draft Minutes for December 15, 2016 – Joint Hearing with Rec/Park Commission](#)
[Draft Minutes for December 15, 2016](#)

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

4. 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 Richards:

We had a three week break and obviously there was a lot of reading and a lot of things were produced in those three weeks, just a couple one that I want to mention, two of them hit me were around parking; on January 1st, in The Chronicle inside section Don't Build Parking Garages They Won't Be Necessary. It talks about cities such as Des Moines, Iowa, and Altamont Springs, Florida. They are looking at the parking requirements. The article goes on to talk about parking standards and what will be affecting those in the future and this is something that we've been talking about quite a bit here. I've been on my bully pulpit around it. The first pressure is millennials driving a lot less; their car ownership is a lot less. The second pressure is technological advancement in that we're going toward autonomous vehicles, and the third is also climate change. It talks about having parking requirements, I know we this on the action item list. It is something to look at and just wanted to bring up. Secondly, there is another article in the New York Times, the 23rd, the same thing, moving beyond the park culture. I recommend you read this as well. So, it talks about the car ownership rates well into the future and as we sit here and approve excess parking above requirements for necessary and desirable, I keep looking out at in the timeline five or ten years and I go what will we do with all this space? We are not going to have cars in. And the last one is after our hearing on Thursday the 15th; the Controller came out with an economic five year financial plan for the city. It is an interesting read, a lot of numbers in it around where we are with the budget et cetera, but there were three takeaways I had from it, first one being the City is at capacity at housing, even if we were to grow more jobs, we don't have places to put people for right now, and the transportation infrastructure as well, is at capacity, and we are having a hard time loading it up anymore, and the third one is actually, our growth is actually moderating, we are not going as a fast as we had in the past, that does not mean we are going to have a recession, but it does pertain to some shortfalls in the budget process, et cetera. The big takeaway for me is, while we have a chance to pause and kind of catch our breath, now is the time to actually be doubling down on taking the time, to build the housing, improve the transportation infrastructure, because we know that there another boom that is going to be coming, this is the time to actually do it and not wait. It clearly requires money. So, anyway that was my read over the break.

Commissioner Moore:

I have a question and I have obviously a comment of congratulations, the City apparently has reached an agreement with AAU and it is a development agreement with a term sheet in place. I'm wondering as to whether or not prior to us looking at the advanced calendar, hearing items regarding AAU in February we could have another debrief with the City Attorney's Office on some of the specifics of the development agreement and the term sheets that our own looking at this project is fully informed of how to look at that.

Jonas P. Ionin, Commission Secretary:

Commissioner Moore, actually we just met with the Zoning Administrator Sanchez yesterday, to looking at the forward calendar and your updated advance it will reflect that the action items on February 2nd are all proposed for indefinite continuance and on that same hearing date, you'll hear the first of the AAU development agreement informational presentation.

Commissioner Moore:

That answers that, thank you very much.

C. DEPARTMENT MATTERS

5. Director's Announcements

Director Rahaim:

Good afternoon Commissioners, and Happy New Year to all of you, I hope you had a great holiday. I thought I might just mention a few things, kind of preview of coming attractions for the next few months to start up the year. Commissioner Moore mentioned the Academy of Art University, the term sheet we are proposing, the first of several hearings on February 2nd, to actually brief you on the term sheet of that term sheet -- to remind you that term sheet is actually, the kind of framework for what will become a development agreement, so, we'll start briefing you on February 2nd. We will also this month and in the next few coming months we'll bring you a series of Planning Code proposed changes related to the MAP2020 work, the Mission Action Plan, we've been working with the community on a series of changes, that will bring to you in small clusters related to PDR uses in the Mission. You will also be seeing this year the draft EIR and later in the year probably the summer the potential action on the Central SOMA Plan, the draft EIR was released at the end of last year, along with actually four other large EIRs, that were all completed by staff by the end of last year, so, those hearings will be coming your way soon as well. And finally we will have at least two hearings perhaps more on proposed changes to the inclusionary housing requirements, probably you heard that Supervisors Kim and Peskin introduced legislation at the very end of last year, we'll be looking at that. I think we will be proposing at least one informational hearing in February with perhaps another after that. The 90 day clock is ticking on that, so, you have to take action, I think by the middle or end of March on that one. So, several large policy and projects coming your way in the first quarter and we'll keep you up to date. Thank you.

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

None

D. 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: Andrew Yip – Joy and happiness, virtue
Georgia Schuttish - Excavation and demolition
Large excavations should be noted on the 311 Notification so neighbors have complete information as required by the Planning Code. The same details that are on the Planning Information Map or in Environmental Documents should be on

the 311 Project Descriptions when there are excavations, whether a project is classified as a demolition or an alteration. This is especially important for projects with major excavations that may require shoring permits.

Excavations of residential lots *may* have implications for:

Whether or not a project is classified as a demolition

Any changes to Section 317 under the proposed Residential Expansion Threshold (RET) The Residential Design Guidelines for both the current Guidelines and the proposed revisions to the Guidelines.

Dino Adelfio – Happy New Year

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.

7. [2015-004827ENV](#) (C. THOMAS: (415) 575-9036)
ALAMEDA CREEK RECAPTURE PROJECT - Public Hearing on the **Draft Environmental Impact Report**. The proposed project is located in Alameda County, within the Sunol Valley on watershed lands owned by the City and County of San Francisco and managed by the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC). The proposed project would recapture water that the SFPUC will release from the Calaveras Reservoir and bypass around the Alameda Creek Diversion Dam when the SFPUC implements instream flow schedules required for future operations of Calaveras Reservoir. Water would be pumped from an existing quarry pit in the Sunol Valley, which collects Alameda Creek water through subsurface seepage, to the SFPUC's regional distribution system. No construction would occur in Alameda Creek.
Preliminary Recommendation: Review and Comment
Note: Written comments will be accepted at the Planning Department until 5:00 p.m. on January 17, 2017.

SPEAKERS: = Chris Thomas – Staff Report
 = Ema Levin – Alameda Recapture Project
 + Leonard Ash – Reliable and resilient source of water, still reviewing the document
 ACTION: Reviewed and Commented

8. [2009.0160E](#) (M. JACINTO: (415) 575-9033)
1500-1540 MARKET STREET/ONE OAK STREET - Public Hearing on the **Draft Environmental Impact Report**. The approximately 18,375-square-foot project site (Assessor Block 0836, Lots: 001, 002, 003, 004, 005) (District 5) is located at the intersection of Market and Oak Streets at Van Ness Avenue in the C-3-G (Downtown Commercial, General) use district, the Van Ness and Market Downtown Residential Special Use District, and is within a 120/400-R-2 Height and Bulk District. The project entails demolition of the site's two existing buildings (at 1500 Market Street on Lot 1, currently accommodating convenience retail use; and 1540 Market Street on Lot 5, occupied by office use) and construction of a 310-unit, 40-story residential tower (to a height of 420 foot-tall, including rooftop mechanical equipment) with ground-floor commercial space, an off-street loading space, and

subsurface parking garage with 155 spaces, resident bicycle parking in a second-floor mezzanine and bicycle parking for visitors in racks on adjacent sidewalks. The project also includes construction of a public plaza within the Oak Street right-of-way adjacent the building site; installation of canopies within the Oak Street plaza and in the sidewalk at the northeast corner of Market and Polk Streets to reduce pedestrian winds; maintenance to the existing station elevator that would provide continual access during project construction; and establishment of a southbound contra-flow fire lane for the exclusive use of emergency vehicle use along the east side of Franklin Street between Market and Oak Streets. (JACINTO)

Preliminary Recommendation: Review and Comment

Note: Written comments will be accepted at the Planning Department until 5:00 p.m. on January 10, 2017.

SPEAKERS: = Michael Jacinto – Staff Report
 - Gil Law – Affordable housing
 = Tom Radulovich – Zero parking alternative
 - Jim Worshel – Parking, transportation
 = Moe Jamil – Shadow mitigation, affordable housing
 = Bob Anderson – Cycling, wind, transportation
 = Tess Welbourn – Transportation
 = Gino Yamamoto – Bicycle, wind
 - Jason Henderson – Inadequate EIR, transportation
 - Jeremy Pollack, Aide to Supervisor Avalos – Parking, transportation, wind
 - Speaker – Too much encroachment on public right of way, bike share, public bathrooms
 ACTION: Reviewed and Commented

9. [2016-013419PCA](#) (D. SANCHEZ: (415) 575-9082)
NEW HOTELS AND MOTELS NEAR PLACES OF ENTERTAINMENT [BOARD FILE NO. 161064] – **Administrative Code and Planning Code Amendment** - Ordinance introduced by Supervisor Breed Ordinance to hold a hearing on noise issues related to proposed projects for construction of new hotels and motels, or conversions of existing structures to hotel or motel uses, to be located within 300 feet of a Place of Entertainment, and to provide recommendations to the Planning Department and/or Department of Building Inspection regarding such projects, and require the Planning Department and Planning Commission to consider noise issues when reviewing proposed hotel and motel projects; 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 with Modifications

SPEAKERS: = Diego Sanchez – Staff Report
 + Conor Johnson, Aide to Supervisor Breed – Preventing conflicts
 ACTION: Adopted a Recommendation for Approval with Modifications
 AYES: Fong, Richards, Koppel, Melgar, Moore
 ABSENT: Hillis, Johnson
 RESOLUTION: 19826

10. [2014.0964ENX](#) (J. DISALVO: (415) 575-9182)
1228 FOLSOM STREET - located on the north side of Folsom Street and the south side of Clementina Street between 8th and 9th Streets, Lots 011, 037 and 038 in Assessor's Block 3729 (District 9) - Request for **Large Project Authorization**, pursuant to Planning Code Section 329, for the demolition of three two-story industrial warehouse buildings and new construction of a four- and-six-story residential building (measuring approximately 29,272 gross square feet), 45-ft in height along Clementina Street and 65-ft along Folsom Street, with 24 dwelling units, 15 below-grade off-street parking spaces, 25 Class 1 bicycle parking spaces, and 3 Class 2 bicycle parking spaces. Under the Large Project Authorization, the project is seeking exceptions to certain Planning Code requirements, including: 1) rear yard (Planning Code Section 134); 2) permitted obstructions (Planning Code Section 136); 3) dwelling unit exposure (Planning Code 140); and, 4) off-street parking (Planning Code Section 151.1). The subject property is located within the RED-MX (Residential Enclave-Mixed), and the Folsom Street NCT (Neighborhood Commercial Transit) Zoning Districts, 45-X and 65-X Height and Bulk Districts, and the Western SoMa Special Use District. Since the project is partially located within the Folsom Street NCT, the project is requesting a variance from the Zoning Administrator to address the Planning Code requirements for: permitted obstructions (Planning Code Section 136), (See Case No. 2014.0964VAR). This action constitutes the Approval Action for the project for the purposes of CEQA, pursuant to Section 31.04(h) of the San Francisco Administrative Code.

Preliminary Recommendation: Approve with Conditions
 (Continued from Regular Meeting of October 13, 2016)

SPEAKERS: = Jonathan DiSalvo – Staff Report
 + Robin May – Project presentation
 + Riyard Ganan – Design presentation
 = Hannah Kellogg – Traffic
 = Brian O'Flynn – Clementine Street

ACTION: Approved with Conditions
 AYES: Fong, Richards, Koppel, Melgar, Moore
 ABSENT: Hillis, Johnson
 MOTION: 19827

11. [2015-002604ENX](#) (D. VU: (415) 575-9120)
667 FOLSOM & 120 HAWTHORNE STREETS - south side between 3rd and Hawthorne Streets – Lots 078, 081 & 082 in Assessor's Block 3750 (District 6) - Request for **Large Project Authorization**, pursuant to Planning Code Sections 329 and 841 including exceptions from the rear yard, dwelling unit exposure, off-street loading and bulk requirements pursuant to Planning Code Sections 134, 140, 152.1 and 270, respectively, for demolition of the existing structures totaling 25,914 square feet and construction of a new 130-ft. tall, thirteen-story mixed-use development totaling 192,771 square feet that includes 8,873 square feet of ground floor commercial use, 183,898 square feet of residential use for 230 dwelling units, approximately 14,050 square feet of common and 1,121 square feet of publicly accessible open space, 133 Class 1 and fifteen Class 2 bicycle parking spaces at the ground floor. The project does not include any off-street vehicular parking. The subject properties are located in the Mixed Use-Residential (MUR) Zoning and 130-G Height and Bulk Districts. 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: Approve with Conditions

SPEAKERS: = Doug Vu – Staff Report
 + Speaker – Project presentation
 + Glenn Rescalvo – Design presentation

ACTION: Approved with Conditions as amended to reflect the current template language regarding affordable housing

AYES: Fong, Richards, Koppel, Melgar, Moore

ABSENT: Hillis, Johnson

MOTION: 19828

F. 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.

12. [2015-000487DRP](#) (N. TRAN: (415) 575-9174)
2438 30TH AVENUE – Located on the east side of 30th Avenue, between Taraval and Ulloa Avenues; Lot 31 in Assessor's Block 2396 (District 4) - Request for **Discretionary Review** of Building Permit Application No. 2015.01.08.5238, proposing the construction of a horizontal and vertical addition with rear excavation to expand the basement, ground and 2nd levels. No work is proposed at the front façade. The Project is located within a RH-1 (Residential, House, One-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.
 Staff Analysis: Abbreviated Discretionary Review
Preliminary Recommendation: Do Not Take Discretionary Review and Approve
 (Continued from Regular Meeting of September 22, 2016)
- SPEAKERS: = Delvin Washington – Staff Report
 - Steve Williams – DR presentation
 - John Hanf – Density, bedroom
 + Benson Lai – Project presentation
 + John Lau – Design presentation
- ACTION: Took DR and Approved with the condition that the second floor roof deck north railing be moved in an additional two feet from the property line and that it may not be solid
- AYES: Fong, Richards, Koppel, Melgar, Moore
- ABSENT: Hillis, Johnson
- DRA NO: 0496
13. [2016-000119DRM](#) (J. SPEIRS: (415) 575-9106)
3015 SAN BRUNO AVENUE - east side of San Bruno Avenue, between Paul and Olmstead Streets; Lot 016 in Assessor's Block 5467 (District 9) - Request is for a **Mandatory Discretionary Review** of an application for a change of use from acupuncture office to a Medical Cannabis Dispensary (MCD) at the ground story, within the NC-2 (Neighborhood

Commercial – Small Scale) Zoning District and 40-X Height and Bulk District. The proposed MCD (d.b.a SBA Wellness) will be approximately 1,644 square feet in total at the ground level with a partial basement. No smoking or cultivation of cannabis is proposed on-site. The associated Building Permit Application 2016.07.28.3597 is for tenant improvements only. No exterior changes or expansions are proposed. 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.

Staff Analysis: Full Analysis

Preliminary Recommendation: Take Discretionary Review and Approve with Conditions

- SPEAKERS:
- = Jeff Speirs – Staff Report
 - + Speaker – Project presentation
 - + Speaker – Project presentation
 - + Stephanie Tucker – Outreach
 - Rev. Franco Quan – No MCD shop on San Bruno Avenue
 - Pastor Tony Ong – Opposed
 - Bella Selda – 2,000 signatures opposed
 - Shirley Chan – No MCD
 - Annie Yuen – Not a good location
 - Speaker – Too close to bus stop with children
 - Speaker – 3,000 signatures opposed
 - Speaker – Leads to other drugs
 - Speaker - Second hand smoke
 - Speaker – Second hand smoke
 - Speaker – No MCD
 - Allie Yen – Block environment
 - + Robert Hudson – Support, responsible users
 - Lisa Tsang – Marijuana related illness increased in legalized states
 - Speaker – No MCD, more crime
 - Speaker – Opposed
 - Christopher Low – Not so close to all the schools
 - Speaker – No MCD
 - Speaker – No MCD
 - Speaker – No MCD
 - Vivian – No MCD
 - Speaker – No MCD
 - Speaker – No MCD
 - Ying Yang Ma – No MCD
 - Carmen – Keep San Bruno safe, no MCD
 - Speaker – No MCD
 - Speaker – No MCD, keep San Bruno safe
 - Speaker – No MCD
 - Speaker – No MCD
 - Vicki Wong – No MCD
 - Speaker – No MCD
 - Speaker – No MCD
 - Speaker – No MCD
 - Yu Jen Jin – No MCD

- Speaker – No MCD
- Yvonne – No MCD
- Sandy Chang - No MCD
- Speaker – No MCD
- Speaker – No MCD
- Speaker – No MCD
- Speaker – No MCD
- Speaker – No MCD
- Speaker – No MCD
- Speaker – No MCD
- Helen Yu – No MCD
- Speaker – No MCD on San Bruno Avenue
- Cindy – No MCD, buy ahead of time
- Amy – Suspicious activity outside, not the right kind of establishment for the neighborhood
- Annie Fu – Listen to the community voice
- Speaker – No MCD
- Wendy – No MCD
- Speaker – No MCD on San Bruno Avenue
- Speaker – No MCD on San Bruno Avenue
- Speaker – Opposed
- Elizabeth Zhao – Enough
- Speaker – No MCD in our neighborhood
- Speaker – No MCD in our neighborhood
- Peter Long – Keep San Bruno safe
- Speaker – No MCD on San Bruno Avenue
- Speaker - No MCD on San Bruno Avenue
- Hazel Lee – Keep children safe
- Christina Wu – Drugs are bad
- Speaker – No MCD
- Speaker – No MCD
- Terry Chan – Safety of my congregation will create more problems than it will solve
- Marlene Tran – Opposed, emergency room influx with marijuana users, impact on children
- Speaker – No MCD on San Bruno Avenue
- Speaker – No MCD on San Bruno Avenue
- Speaker – Support SBA wellness
- Karen – We don't need any more MCD's in SF
- Speaker – No MCD
- Speaker – No MCD
- + Jacob Saltzman – MCD's improve safety in neighborhoods
- Speaker – No MCD in our neighborhood
- Speaker – No MCD in our neighborhood
- Speaker – No MCD in our neighborhood
- + Chevron Brady – Safe medical access
- David Low – Bad for our neighborhood

- Speaker – No MCD, keep San Bruno safe
- Speaker – No MCD, keep San Bruno safe
- Speaker – No MCD, keep San Bruno safe
- Speaker – No MCD, keep San Bruno safe
- Speaker – No MCD, keep San Bruno safe
- Speaker – No MCD, keep San Bruno safe
- Speaker – No MCD, keep San Bruno safe
- Speaker – No MCD, keep San Bruno safe
- Speaker – No MCD, keep San Bruno safe
- Speaker – No MCD, keep San Bruno safe
- Julia Yook – Less crime
- Susan Chow – Stop this
- + Billy Burnett – Cannabis is safe
- + Shay ENglang – Layered security plan
- Candy Lee – No good for kids
- Claudine Jo – No MCD
- Speaker – No MCD
- Speaker – No MCD
- Speaker – No MCD
- Speaker – No MCD
- Speaker – No MCD
- Speaker – No MCD
- Speaker – No MCD
- Speaker – No MCD
- Speaker – No MCD
- Speaker – No MCD
- Speaker – No MCD
- Speaker – No MCD
- Speaker – No MCD
- Speaker – No MCD
- Speaker – No MCD
- Susanne – Crime in the area
- Maggie – No MCD
- + Kathy – Support, access
- Steven – Potential crime, resale
- Nelson Ng – Concerned about our children
- Speaker – High school students
- Maggie Lin – Children
- Judy – Second hand smoke
- Speaker – No MCD in our neighborhood
- Speaker – No MCD in our neighborhood
- Speaker – No MCD in our neighborhood
- Speaker – No MCD in our neighborhood
- Speaker – No MCD in our neighborhood
- Speaker – No MCD in our neighborhood
- Speaker – No MCD in our neighborhood
- Jamie – Right place and time for everything, this is not the right place
- David – No MCD
- Speaker – Daily commuters, including young children
- Speaker - No MCD, a lot of schools
- Speaker – No MCD

- Speaker – No MCD
- Speaker – No MCD
- + Ezekial – Great place
- + Wilson Ng – Medical attributes
- + Speaker – Support for SBA, husband’s experience with anxiety
- + Johnson – Helped me with my back
- + Speaker – Convenient for neighborhood users
- + Speaker – Support
- Ken – Other options
- Susanne – Protect our children
- Cynthia – No MCD in our neighborhood
- Abby – Security concerns
- + Dylan Chin – Marijuana versus tobacco
- Speaker – Opposed because of the bus stop and daycare center
- Speaker opposed to MCD, too close to schools
- Eileen Zhan – No MCD
- Speaker – No marijuana in my area
- Theresa – Homeless
- Wendy – Kids safety
- Speaker – No MCD
- Jason Tran – No MCD, I am scared to go to school now
- Jenny Jue – No MCD
- Speaker – Help educate young people
- Speaker – No escape
- Speaker – Opposed to the MCD, near the school, church, and children
- Ken Wong – Marijuana smell
- Yang Jin Chin – Opposed, schools
- Joanna – No MCD
- Andrew Yip – Negative impacts
- Speaker – No MCD, bad for the environment
- Speaker – No MCD, bad for the environment
- Speaker – No MCD
- Joyce Lau – Safety
- Ellen – 300 speakers and 3,000 signatures in opposition
- Speaker – Too close to school
- Josephine Jan – Opposition

ACTION: After hearing and closing public comment; Continued to September 21, 2017

AYES: Fong, Richards, Melgar, Moore

NAYES: Koppel

ABSENT: Hillis, Johnson

G. PUBLIC COMMENT

At this time, members of the public may address the Commission on items of interest to the public that are within the subject matter jurisdiction of the Commission except agenda items. With respect to agenda items, your opportunity to address the Commission will be afforded when the item is reached in the meeting with one exception. When the agenda item has already been

reviewed in a public hearing at which members of the public were allowed to testify and the Commission has closed the public hearing, your opportunity to address the Commission must be exercised during the Public Comment portion of the Calendar. Each member of the public may address the Commission for up to three minutes.

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

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

ADJOURNMENT - 6:45 P.M.