Memo to the Planning Commission

HEARING DATE: MARCH 19, 2020
Continued from the December 19, 2019 Hearing

Date: March 6, 2020
Record No.: 2018-011717CUA
Project Address: 1369-1371 Sanchez Street
Zoning: RH-2 (Residential – House, Two Family) Zoning District
40-X Height and Bulk District
Block/Lot: 6579/027
Project Sponsor: Patrick Buscovich
235 Montgomery, Suite 1140
San Francisco, CA 94104
Property Owner: Luba Troyanosky Trust
San Francisco, CA 94118
Staff Contact: Stephanie Cisneros – (415) 575-9186
stephanie.cisneros@sfgov.org
Recommendation: Approval with Conditions

BACKGROUND
On October 24, 2019 the Planning Commission closed public comment and continued the proposed project at 1369-1371 Sanchez Street to December 19, 2019. During deliberation, the Commission voted 2-2 on a motion to approve the proposed project, which failed. The Commission then voted to continue the item to December 19, 2019. On December 19, 2019, the Commission voted to continue the item to February 6, 2020 in order for the Project Sponsor to revise the project to include an Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU). Prior to the February 6, 2020 hearing, the Project Sponsor requested a continuance to March 19, 2020 to allow for additional time to revise the proposal.

CURRENT PROPOSAL
The proposal is for a Conditional Use Authorization pursuant to Planning Code Sections 303 and 317 to document and legalize the tantamount to demolition of a three-story, 2,912 square foot, two-family residence garage and to permit the construction of a three-story, two-unit residence with a 532 square-foot ADU at the ground floor and garage with 2 Class 1 bicycle parking spaces. The proposed project was previously reviewed by the Commission under 2015-007765DRP.

REQUIRED COMMISSION ACTION
In order for the Project to proceed, the Commission must grant a Conditional Use Authorization pursuant to Planning Code Section 303 and 317 for tantamount to demolition of a residential building within the RH-2 (Residential-House, Two Family) Zoning District and 40-X Height and Bulk District.
BASIS FOR RECOMMENDATION

- The Department finds that the Project is on balance and consistent with the Objectives and Policies of the General Plan. Although the Project exceeds the demolition thresholds as outlined in Planning Code Section 317, the project will continue to provide two units that will be updated and expanded within the buildable area and will include the addition of an ADU at the ground floor, per the Commission’s direction.

RECOMMENDATION: Approve the project as proposed

Attachments:
Updated Plans and Renderings dated February 16, 2020
Updated Planning Commission Draft Motion
ADOPTING FINDINGS RELATING TO THE APPROVAL OF A CONDITIONAL USE AUTHORIZATION PURSUANT TO PLANNING CODE SECTIONS 303 AND 317 REQUIRING CONDITIONAL USE AUTHORIZATION FOR THE LEGALIZATION OF TANAMOUNT TO DEMOLITION OF AN EXISTING TWO-UNIT RESIDENCE AND THE CONSTRUCTION OF A NEW TWO-UNIT RESIDENCE WITH ACCESSORY DWELLING UNIT AT 1369 TO 1371 SANCHEZ STREET WITHIN AN RH-2 (RESIDENTIAL – HOUSE, TWO FAMILY) ZONING DISTRICT AND A 40-X HEIGHT AND BULK DISTRICT.

PREAMBLE

On August 6, 2018, the Department of Building Inspection (hereinafter “DBI”) opened Complaint Case No. 201882681 regarding the two-unit residence at 1369 to 1371 Sanchez Street, Assessor’s Block 6579, Lot 027 (hereinafter “Project Site”). The complaint stated that construction on the site exceeded the scope approved under Building Application No. 2018.0819.4709. The referenced permit approved a remodel at the front elevation and horizontal addition at the south to provide three new bedrooms and two bathrooms at the third floor, remodel kitchen and add vanity at second floor, relocate unit one from second floor to first floor, and add a roof deck.

On August 6, 2018, the Planning Department (hereinafter “Department”) opened Code Enforcement Case No. 2018-011345ENF based on a complaint that demolition and excavation had occurred beyond the scope of an approved permit, per DBI Complaint No. 201882681. The Department subsequently confirmed that additional exterior walls and an area of existing floor plate had been demolished without authorization.

On March 6, 2019, Patrick Buscovich (hereinafter “Project Sponsor”) filed Application No. 2018-011717CUA (hereinafter “Application”) with the Department for a Conditional Use Authorization under Planning Code Sections 303 and 317 to legalize tantamount to demolition of a three-story, 2,912 square foot, two-family
residence, and to permit the construction of a three-story, 3,490 square foot, two-unit residence and garage (hereinafter “Project”) at the Project Site.


On December 19, 2019, the Commission conducted a duly noticed public hearing at a regularly scheduled meeting on Conditional Use Authorization Application No. 2018-011717CUA and continued the hearing to February 6, 2020.

Prior to the February 6, 2020 Hearing, the Project Sponsor requested a continuance to March 19, 2020 to allow for additional time to revise the proposal. The item was then continued without hearing to April 9, 2020.

The Planning Department Commission Secretary is the custodian of records; the File for Record No. 2018-011717CUA is located at 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, California.

The Commission has heard and considered the testimony presented to it at the public hearing and has further considered written materials and oral testimony presented on behalf of the applicant, Department staff, and other interested parties.

MOVED, that the Commission hereby authorizes the Conditional Use Authorization as requested in Application No. 2018-011717CUA, subject to the conditions contained in “EXHIBIT A” of this motion, based on the following findings:

FINDINGS

Having reviewed the materials identified in the preamble above, and having heard all testimony and arguments, this Commission finds, concludes, and determines as follows:

1. The above recitals are accurate and constitute findings of this Commission.

2. **Project Description.** The Project seeks to legalize the tantamount to demolition of a three-story, 2,912 square foot, two-family residence foot garage, and to permit the construction of a three-story, 2,689 square foot, two-unit residence with a 532 square-foot accessory dwelling unit (ADU) and a 357 square-foot garage within a Residential House – Two Family (RH-2) Zoning District and a 40-X Height and Bulk District.

3. **Site Description and Present Use.** The property at 1369 to 1371 Sanchez Street is located on the east side of Sanchez Street between Cesar Chavez and 27th Street, Lot 027 in Assessor’s Block 6579 and in the RH-2 (Residential-House, Two Family) Zoning District and with a 40-X Height and Bulk designation. The approximately 2,080 square foot downward sloping lot has 26 feet of frontage and
a depth of 80 feet. The lot contains a three-story-over-garage, two-unit residential building constructed ca. 1907 but remodeled in the Art Deco style in 1935.

4. **Surrounding Properties and Neighborhood.** The subject property is located in the Noe Valley neighborhood within District 8. Parcels within the immediate vicinity consist of residential single, two- and multi-family dwellings of varied design and construction dates. The block face is characterized by two- to three-story buildings of mixed architectural style. The buildings on the block vary in density from single-family residences to small multi-unit buildings.

5. **Public Outreach and Comments.** The Department has received one letter in opposition to the Project expressing concern over how the project became a tantamount to demolition, the proposed façade alterations, and the lack of an ADU included in the proposal.

6. **Planning Code Compliance.** The Commission finds that the Project is consistent with the relevant provisions of the Planning Code in the following manner:

   **A. Height.** Planning Code Section 260 requires that all structures be no taller than the height prescribed in the subject height and bulk district. The proposed Project is located in a 40-X Height and Bulk District, with a 40-foot height limit. Planning Code Section 261 further restricts height in RH-2 Districts to 30-feet at the front lot line, then at such setback, height shall increase at an angle of 45° toward the rear lot line until the prescribed 40-foot height limit is reached.

   *The project proposes a building that will be approximately 28'-6” tall.*

   **B. Front Setback Requirement.** Planning Code Section 132 requires, in RH-2 Districts, a front setback that complies to legislated setbacks (if any) or a front back based on the average of adjacent properties (15 foot maximum).

   *The Project will maintain a front setback of approximately 7’-10”, based on the average of the adjacent properties.*

   **C. Rear Yard.** Planning Code Section 134 requires a minimum rear yard depth of 45 percent of the total lot depth on which the building is situated, except to the extent that a reduction is permitted using the average between the depths of the rear building walls of the two adjacent buildings.

   *The Project will construct a two-unit residence located entirely within the buildable area of the lot and will remove an existing stair currently located within the required rear yard. The Project does not propose construction within the rear yard such that a Variance from Planning Code Section 134 would be required.*
D. **Side Yard Requirement.** Planning Code Section 133 does not require side yard setbacks in RH-2 Districts.

The Project proposes constructing to both side property lines since no side setbacks are required in the RH-2 District.

E. **Residential Design Guidelines.** Per Planning Code Section 311, the construction of new residential buildings and alteration of existing residential buildings in R Districts shall be consistent with the design policies and guidelines of the General Plan and with the "Residential Design Guidelines.

The Residential Design Team previously reviewed the proposal and determined that the Project complied with the Residential Design Guidelines and provided the following comments:

- The project and privacy issues are within the tolerances to be expected when living in a dense, urban environment like San Francisco.
- The building scale, massing and materials are appropriate as the project is located in a neighborhood of mixed visual character with regard to both scale and architecture.

F. **Front Setback Landscaping and Permeability Requirements.** Planning Code Section 132 requires that the required front setback be at least 20% unpaved and devoted to plant material and at least 50% permeable to increase storm water infiltration.

The Project complies with Section 132 as it provides approximately 41 square feet of landscaping and approximately 78 square feet of permeable surface in the required 204 square foot front setback area.

G. **Street Frontage Requirement.** Planning Code Section 144 requires that off-street parking entrances be limited to one-third of the ground story width along the front lot line and no less than one-third be devoted to windows, entrances to dwelling units, landscaping and other architectural features that provide visual relief and interest for the street frontage.

The Project complies with the street frontage requirement as it exceeds the visual relief minimum and adheres to the off-street entrance maximum.

H. **Street Frontage, Parking and Loading Access Restrictions.** Off-street parking shall meet the standards set forth in Planning Code Section 155 with respect to location, ingress/egress, arrangement, dimensions, etc.

Proposed off-street parking for one vehicle will be located wholly within the property, comply with access, arrangement and street frontage dimensional standards.

I. **Usable Open Space.** Planning Code Section 135 requires, in RH-2 Districts, usable open space that is accessible by each dwelling (125 square feet per unit if private, or 166 square if shared).
The Project provides usable open space that exceeding the minimum amount required.

J. **Off-Street Parking.** Planning Code Section 151 does not require off-street parking, and permits 1.5 parking spaces for every dwelling unit provided.

The Project proposed to maintain the existing off-street parking for one vehicle on site.

K. **Bicycle Parking.** Planning Code Section 155.2 requires one weather-protected bicycle parking space per dwelling unit. The requirements apply when constructing a new building.

The Project proposes a two-unit building. Two bicycle parking spaces are proposed in the garage, meeting the requirement of Planning Code Section 155.2.

L. **Residential Density, Dwelling Units.** Per Planning Code Section 209.1, up to two units per lot are principally permitted in RH-2 Districts and up to one unit per 1,500 square feet of lot area is allowed with Conditional Use Authorization.

The Project proposes demolition of the existing two-family residence and reconstruction of a two-family residence with ADU on the 2,080 square foot parcel.

7. **Loss of Residential Unit through Demolition.** Planning Code Section 317(g)(5) establishes additional criteria for the Planning Commission to consider when reviewing applications for the loss of a residential unit as the result of a demolition. The Planning Commission shall consider the following:

A. **Whether the property is free of a history of serious, continuing Code violations.**

The Project Site has serious, continuing Code violations. In 2018, DBI determined that the subject two-family dwelling exceeded the scope of work approved and required proper documentation and permitting. Following multiple site visits in 2018 and 2019, Planning determined that the Project violated Planning Code Section 174 (Unpermitted Alterations), Section 311 (Permit Review Procedures), and Section 317 (Demolition) without authorization. The proposed Project would abate both violations.

B. **Whether the housing has been maintained in a decent, safe, and sanitary condition.**

Planning was unable to verify whether the structure was in decent condition due to the substantial amount of demolition and replacement already performed.

C. **Whether the property is an “historical resource” under CEQA.**

The Planning Department reviewed the Supplemental Information Form submitted and provided a historic resource determination in a Preservation Team Review (PTR) Form. The historic resource determination concluded that the subject property is not eligible for listing in the California Register of
Historical Resources (CRHR) individually or as a contributor to a historic district. Therefore, the existing structure is not a historic resource under CEQA.

D. **Whether the removal of the resource will have a substantial adverse impact under CEQA.**
   The Planning Department determined that the existing structure is not a historic resource. Therefore, the removal of the structure would not result in a significant adverse impact on historic resources under CEQA.

E. **Whether the project converts rental housing to other forms of tenure or occupancy.**
   The existing two-family residence is subject to rent control and the reconstructed units will continue to be rental units.

F. **Whether the project removes rental units subject to the Residential Rent Stabilization and Arbitration Ordinance or affordable housing.**
   The Project proposes to demolish an existing two-family dwelling, which is generally subject to the Residential Rent Stabilization and Arbitration Ordinance. Definitive determinations on the applicability of the Residential Rent Stabilization and Arbitration Ordinance are the purview of the Rent Board. The existing dwelling units are not affordable housing units.

G. **Whether the project conserves existing housing to preserve cultural and economic neighborhood diversity.**
   Although the Project proposes the demolition of an existing two-family dwelling building, the units are not habitable and the reconstruction would restore the dwelling units.

H. **Whether the project conserves neighborhood character to preserve neighborhood cultural and economic diversity.**
   The Project would improve cultural and economic diversity by increasing the number of bedrooms, and the Planning Department determined that the replacement building is of appropriate scale and development pattern that would conserve the established neighborhood character.

I. **Whether the project protects the relative affordability of existing housing.**
   The Project removes older dwelling units and replaces them with a newly constructed dwelling units and an ADU. Older dwelling units are generally considered to be more affordable than a recently constructed unit. However, the existing dwelling units are not habitable, making the effect of reconstruction has on affordability difficult to quantify.

J. **Whether the project increases the number of permanently affordable units as governed by Section 415.**
   The Project is not subject to the provisions of Planning Code Section 415, as the Project proposes less than 10 dwelling units.

K. **Whether the project locates in-fill housing on appropriate sites in established neighborhoods.**
The Project proposes in-fill housing, reconstructing two dwelling units in the same general area as they were previously, in keeping with the established topography of the site.

L. **Whether the project increases the number of family-sized units on-site.**
   The Project proposes an opportunity for family-sized housing by constructing two, two-bedroom units and a one-bedroom ADU to replace the previous one-bedroom units.

M. **Whether the project creates new supportive housing.**
   The Project does not create new supportive housing.

N. **Whether the project is of superb architectural and urban design, meeting all relevant design guidelines, to enhance existing neighborhood character.**
   The Planning Department determined that the replacement building is in keeping with the overall scale, massing and design of the immediately surrounding development.

O. **Whether the project increases the number of on-site Dwelling Units.**
   The Project will reconstruct the two-family dwellings and increase their sizes. Both units will include two bedrooms. An ADU will be added to the ground floor behind the garage.

P. **Whether the project increases the number of on-site bedrooms.**
   The existing units contain one bedroom each, while the proposed construction proposes two bedrooms in each unit. The proposed ADU at the ground floor will have one bedroom.

Q. **Whether or not the replacement project would maximize density on the subject lot.**
   The Project proposes to maximize density at the Project Site.

R. **If replacing a building not subject to the Residential Rent Stabilization and Arbitration Ordinance, whether the new project replaces all of the existing units with new Dwelling Units of a similar size and with the same number of bedrooms.**
   The Project proposes to replace the dwelling units subject to the Residential Rent Stabilization and Arbitration Ordinance. The Project proposes two two-bedroom units, both of similar size and an ADU. The existing units contain one bedroom each.

8. **Conditional Use Findings.** Planning Code Section 303 establishes criteria for the Planning Commission to consider when reviewing applications for Conditional Use authorization. On balance, the project complies with said criteria in that:

   A. The proposed new uses and building, at the size and intensity contemplated and at the proposed location, will provide a development that is necessary or desirable, and compatible with, the neighborhood or the community.

   The use and size of the Project is compatible with the surrounding neighborhood, as it seeks to reconstruct a two-unit dwelling at larger scales than was previously existing. The building will be in
conformity with the Residential Design Guidelines. Overall, the reconstruction of uninhabitable dwelling units is necessary and desirable for the surrounding community.

B. The proposed project will not be detrimental to the health, safety, convenience or general welfare of persons residing or working in the vicinity. There are no features of the project that could be detrimental to the health, safety or convenience of those residing or working the area, in that:

(1) Nature of proposed site, including its size and shape, and the proposed size, shape and arrangement of structures;

The height and bulk of the existing building will be reduced during construction and will not alter the existing appearance or character of the project vicinity.

(2) The accessibility and traffic patterns for persons and vehicles, the type and volume of such traffic, and the adequacy of proposed off-street parking and loading;

The Planning Code does not require off-street parking or loading for the proposed Project. The proposal proposes one off-street parking. There will be no increase in maximum occupancy for the Project Site following reconstruction, and therefore no increase in the volume of traffic.

(3) The safeguards afforded to prevent noxious or offensive emissions such as noise, glare, dust and odor;

As the Project is residential in nature, the proposed residential use is not considered to have the potential to produce noxious or offensive emissions.

(4) Treatment given, as appropriate, to such aspects as landscaping, screening, open spaces, parking and loading areas, service areas, lighting and signs;

The Project is residential and will be landscaped accordingly.

C. That the use as proposed will comply with the applicable provisions of the Planning Code and will not adversely affect the General Plan.

The Project complies with all relevant requirements and standards of the Planning Code and is consistent with objectives and policies of the General Plan as detailed below.

D. That the use as proposed would provide development that is in conformity with the purpose of the applicable Neighborhood Commercial District.

The Project is consistent with the stated purpose of the RH-2 Zoning District, which is characterized by a mixture of dwelling unit types, including apartment buildings, and have a broad range of unit sizes.
9. **General Plan Compliance.** The Project is, on balance, consistent with the following Objectives and Policies of the General Plan:

**HOUSING ELEMENT**

**Objectives and Policies**

**OBJECTIVE 2:**
RETAIN EXISTING HOUSING UNITS, AND PROMOTE SAFETY AND MAINTENANCE STANDARDS, WITHOUT JEOPARDIZING AFFORDABILITY.

**Policy 2.1:**
Discourage the demolition of sound existing housing, unless the demolition results in a net increase in affordable housing.

*The proposal, though a demolition, is necessary for the repair and rehabilitation of the subject building. The project will restore two larger units of housing and add an ADU.*

**Policy 2.5:**
Encourage and support the seismic retrofitting of the existing housing stock.

*The proposal includes seismic upgrades that will bring the subject building up to current Building Code standards.*

**URBAN DESIGN ELEMENT**

**Objectives and Policies**

**OBJECTIVE 1:**
EMPHASIS OF THE CHARACTERISTIC PATTERN WHICH GIVES TO THE CITY AND ITS NEIGHBORHOODS AN IMAGE, A SENSE OF PURPOSE, AND A MEANS OF ORIENTATION.

**Policy 1.3**
Recognize that buildings, when seen together, produce a total effect that characterizes the city and its districts.

*The proposed replacement building reflects the existing mixed architectural character, varying heights along the block face such that the Project would be in keeping with the neighborhood development pattern.*

10. **Planning Code Section 101.1(b)** establishes eight priority-planning policies and requires review of permits for consistency with said policies. On balance, the project complies with said policies in that:
A. That existing neighborhood-serving retail uses be preserved and enhanced and future opportunities for resident employment in and ownership of such businesses be enhanced.

The proposal is for reconstruction of an existing two-unit building and the addition of an ADU; commercial uses in the neighborhood will not be affected by this project.

B. That existing housing and neighborhood character be conserved and protected in order to preserve the cultural and economic diversity of our neighborhoods.

The proposal will restore an existing residential use, consistent with the residential character of the surrounding neighborhood.

C. That the City's supply of affordable housing be preserved and enhanced,

The Project Site does not currently possess affordable housing units. The Project does not propose any units designated as affordable housing. Therefore, the Project will not impact the City's supply of affordable housing.

D. That commuter traffic not impede MUNI transit service or overburden our streets or neighborhood parking.

The Project would not have a significant adverse effect on automobile traffic congestion or create parking problems in the neighborhood.

E. That a diverse economic base be maintained by protecting our industrial and service sectors from displacement due to commercial office development, and that future opportunities for resident employment and ownership in these sectors be enhanced.

The Project is a residential project in an RH-2 District; therefore the Project would not affect industrial or service sector uses or related employment opportunities. Ownership of industrial or service sector businesses would not be affected by the Project.

F. That the City achieve the greatest possible preparedness to protect against injury and loss of life in an earthquake.

The Project will be designed and will be constructed to conform to the structural and seismic safety requirements of the Building Code. This proposal will not impact the property's ability to withstand an earthquake.

G. That landmarks and historic buildings be preserved.

Currently, the Project Site does not contain any City Landmarks or historic buildings.
H. That our parks and open space and their access to sunlight and vistas be protected from development.

The Project will have no negative impact on existing parks and open spaces. The height of the proposed structure is compatible with the established neighborhood development.

11. The Project is consistent with and would promote the general and specific purposes of the Code provided under Section 101.1(b) in that, as designed, the Project would contribute to the character and stability of the neighborhood and would constitute a beneficial development.

12. The Commission hereby finds that approval of the Conditional Use Authorization would promote the health, safety and welfare of the City.
DECISION

That based upon the Record, the submissions by the Applicant, the staff of the Department and other interested parties, the oral testimony presented to this Commission at the public hearings, and all other written materials submitted by all parties, the Commission hereby APPROVES Conditional Use Authorization Application No. 2018-011717CUA subject to the following conditions attached hereto as “EXHIBIT A” in general conformance with plans on file, dated February 16, 2020, and stamped “EXHIBIT B”, which is incorporated herein by reference as though fully set forth.

APPEAL AND EFFECTIVE DATE OF MOTION: Any aggrieved person may appeal this Conditional Use Authorization to the Board of Supervisors within thirty (30) days after the date of this Motion. The effective date of this Motion shall be the date of this Motion if not appealed (after the 30-day period has expired) OR the date of the decision of the Board of Supervisors if appealed to the Board of Supervisors. For further information, please contact the Board of Supervisors at (415) 554-5184, City Hall, Room 244, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, San Francisco, CA 94102.

Protest of Fee or Exaction: You may protest any fee or exaction subject to Government Code Section 66000 that is imposed as a condition of approval by following the procedures set forth in Government Code Section 66020. The protest must satisfy the requirements of Government Code Section 66020(a) and must be filed within 90 days of the date of the first approval or conditional approval of the development referencing the challenged fee or exaction. For purposes of Government Code Section 66020, the date of imposition of the fee shall be the date of the earliest discretionary approval by the City of the subject development.

If the City has not previously given Notice of an earlier discretionary approval of the project, the Planning Commission’s adoption of this Motion, Resolution, Discretionary Review Action or the Zoning Administrator’s Variance Decision Letter constitutes the approval or conditional approval of the development and the City hereby gives NOTICE that the 90-day protest period under Government Code Section 66020 has begun. If the City has already given Notice that the 90-day approval period has begun for the subject development, then this document does not re-commence the 90-day approval period.

I hereby certify that the Planning Commission ADOPTED the foregoing Motion on April 9, 2020.

Jonas P. Ionin
Commission Secretary

AYES:

NAYS:

ABSENT:
ADOPTED: April 9, 2020
EXHIBIT A

AUTHORIZATION

This authorization is for a conditional use to allow legalization of a tantamount to demolition of a three-story, 2,912 square foot, two-family residence with garage and to permit the construction of a three-story, 3,490 square foot, two-unit residence with ADU and garage with 2 Class 1 bicycle parking spaces located at 1369-1371 Sanchez Street, Assessor’s Block 6579, Lot 027 pursuant to Planning Code Section(s) 303 and 317 within the RH-2 Zoning District and a 40-X Height and Bulk District; in general conformance with plans, dated February 16, 2020, and stamped “EXHIBIT B” included in the docket for Record No. 2018-011717CUA and subject to conditions of approval reviewed and approved by the Commission on April 9, 2020 under Motion No XXXXXX. This authorization and the conditions contained herein run with the property and not with a particular Project Sponsor, business, or operator.

RECORDATION OF CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

Prior to the issuance of the building permit or commencement of use for the Project the Zoning Administrator shall approve and order the recordation of a Notice in the Official Records of the Recorder of the City and County of San Francisco for the subject property. This Notice shall state that the project is subject to the conditions of approval contained herein and reviewed and approved by the Planning Commission on April 9, 2020 under Motion No XXXXXX.

PRINTING OF CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL ON PLANS

The conditions of approval under the 'Exhibit A’ of this Planning Commission Motion No. XXXXXX shall be reproduced on the Index Sheet of construction plans submitted with the site or building permit application for the Project. The Index Sheet of the construction plans shall reference to the Conditional Use authorization and any subsequent amendments or modifications.

SEVERABILITY

The Project shall comply with all applicable City codes and requirements. If any clause, sentence, section or any part of these conditions of approval is for any reason held to be invalid, such invalidity shall not affect or impair other remaining clauses, sentences, or sections of these conditions. This decision conveys no right to construct, or to receive a building permit. “Project Sponsor” shall include any subsequent responsible party.

CHANGES AND MODIFICATIONS

Changes to the approved plans may be approved administratively by the Zoning Administrator. Significant changes and modifications of conditions shall require Planning Commission approval of a new Conditional Use authorization.
Conditions of Approval, Compliance, Monitoring, and Reporting

PERFORMANCE

1. **Validity.** The authorization and right vested by virtue of this action is valid for three (3) years from the effective date of the Motion. The Department of Building Inspection shall have issued a Building Permit or Site Permit to construct the project and/or commence the approved use within this three-year period.

   *For information about compliance, contact Code Enforcement, Planning Department at 415-575-6863, www.sf-planning.org*

2. **Expiration and Renewal.** Should a Building or Site Permit be sought after the three (3) year period has lapsed, the project sponsor must seek a renewal of this Authorization by filing an application for an amendment to the original Authorization or a new application for Authorization. Should the project sponsor decline to so file, and decline to withdraw the permit application, the Commission shall conduct a public hearing in order to consider the revocation of the Authorization. Should the Commission not revoke the Authorization following the closure of the public hearing, the Commission shall determine the extension of time for the continued validity of the Authorization.

   *For information about compliance, contact Code Enforcement, Planning Department at 415-575-6863, www.sf-planning.org*

3. **Diligent Pursuit.** Once a site or Building Permit has been issued, construction must commence within the timeframe required by the Department of Building Inspection and be continued diligently to completion. Failure to do so shall be grounds for the Commission to consider revoking the approval if more than three (3) years have passed since this Authorization was approved.

   *For information about compliance, contact Code Enforcement, Planning Department at 415-575-6863, www.sf-planning.org*

4. **Extension.** All time limits in the preceding three paragraphs may be extended at the discretion of the Zoning Administrator where implementation of the project is delayed by a public agency, an appeal or a legal challenge and only by the length of time for which such public agency, appeal or challenge has caused delay.

   *For information about compliance, contact Code Enforcement, Planning Department at 415-575-6863, www.sf-planning.org*

5. **Conformity with Current Law.** No application for Building Permit, Site Permit, or other entitlement shall be approved unless it complies with all applicable provisions of City Codes in effect at the time of such approval.

   *For information about compliance, contact Code Enforcement, Planning Department at 415-575-6863, www.sf-planning.org*
DESIGN – COMPLIANCE AT PLAN STAGE

6. **Final Materials.** The Project Sponsor shall continue to work with Planning Department on the building design. Final materials, glazing, color, texture, landscaping, and detailing shall be subject to Department staff review and approval. The architectural addenda shall be reviewed and approved by the Planning Department prior to issuance.

   For information about compliance, contact the Case Planner, Planning Department at 415-558-6378, www.sf-planning.org

7. **Garbage, Composting and Recycling Storage.** Space for the collection and storage of garbage, composting, and recycling shall be provided within enclosed areas on the property and clearly labeled and illustrated on the building permit plans. Space for the collection and storage of recyclable and compostable materials that meets the size, location, accessibility and other standards specified by the San Francisco Recycling Program shall be provided at the ground level of the buildings.

   For information about compliance, contact the Case Planner, Planning Department at 415-558-6378, www.sf-planning.org

8. **Landscaping.** Pursuant to Planning Code Section 132, the Project Sponsor shall submit a site plan to the Planning Department prior to Planning approval of the building permit application indicating that 50% of the front setback areas shall be surfaced in permeable materials and further, that 20% of the front setback areas shall be landscaped with approved plant species. The size and specie of plant materials and the nature of the permeable surface shall be as approved by the Department of Public Works.

   For information about compliance, contact the Case Planner, Planning Department at 415-558-6378, www.sf-planning.org

9. **Bicycle Parking.** The Project shall provide no fewer than one (1) Class 1 bicycle parking space as required by Planning Code Sections 155.1 and 155.2.

   For information about compliance, contact Code Enforcement, Planning Department at 415-575-6863, www.sf-planning.org

MONITORING - AFTER ENTITLEMENT

10. **Enforcement.** Violation of any of the Planning Department conditions of approval contained in this Motion or of any other provisions of Planning Code applicable to this Project shall be subject to the enforcement procedures and administrative penalties set forth under Planning Code Section 176 or Section 176.1. The Planning Department may also refer the violation complaints to other city departments and agencies for appropriate enforcement action under their jurisdiction.

   For information about compliance, contact Code Enforcement, Planning Department at 415-575-6863, www.sf-planning.org
11. Revocation due to Violation of Conditions. Should implementation of this Project result in complaints from interested property owners, residents, or commercial lessees which are not resolved by the Project Sponsor and found to be in violation of the Planning Code and/or the specific conditions of approval for the Project as set forth in Exhibit A of this Motion, the Zoning Administrator shall refer such complaints to the Commission, after which it may hold a public hearing on the matter to consider revocation of this authorization.

For information about compliance, contact Code Enforcement, Planning Department at 415-575-6863, www.sf-planning.org
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