

# SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING COMMISSION



## Meeting Minutes

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

**Thursday, April 19, 2018**  
**1:00 p.m.**  
**Regular Meeting**

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

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

**STAFF IN ATTENDANCE:** John Rahaim – Director of Planning, Aaron Starr, Audrey Butkus, David Brosky, Svetha Ambati, Teresa Ojeda, Tam Tran, Christopher May, Veronica Flores, Marcelle Boudreaux, Jonas P. Ionin –Commission Secretary

**SPEAKER KEY:**

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

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

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

1. 2018-002387CUA (L. HOAGLAND: (415) 575-6823)  
901 BAYSHORE BOULEVARD – south eastern side of Bayshore Boulevard, on the southeast corner at Silver Street; Lot 072 in Assessor's Block 5402 (District 10) - Request for **Conditional Use Authorization**, pursuant to Planning Code Sections 121.2, 303 and 710, to allow a non-residential use greater than 3,000 square feet within a NC-1 (Neighborhood Commercial, Cluster) Zoning District and 40-X Height and Bulk District. This action

constitutes the Approval Action for the project for the purposes of CEQA, pursuant to San Francisco Administrative Code Section [31.04\(h\)](#).

*Preliminary Recommendation: Approve with Conditions*  
**(Proposed Continuance to April 26, 2018)**

SPEAKERS: None  
 ACTION: Continued to April 26, 2018  
 AYES: Fong, Hillis, Johnson, Koppel, Moore  
 NAYS: Richards  
 ABSENT: Melgar

2. 2017-014849CUA (S. ADINA: (415) 575-8722)  
220 POST STREET – northern side of Post Street between Grant Avenue and Stockton Street; lot 007 of Assessor’s Block 0294 (District 3) – Request for a **Conditional Use Authorization**, pursuant to Planning Code Section 303 and 210.2 to establish a change of use from an existing Retail Sales and Service use to an Office use on the fourth and fifth floors of the subject building, within a C-3-R (Downtown-Retail) Zoning District and 80-130-F Height and Bulk District.  
**(Proposed Continuance to May 17, 2018)**

SPEAKERS: None  
 ACTION: Continued to May 17, 2018  
 AYES: Fong, Hillis, Johnson, Koppel, Moore  
 NAYS: Richards  
 ABSENT: Melgar

3. 2016-011486CUA (M. CHRISTENSEN: (415) 575-8742)  
1713 YOSEMITE AVENUE – south side of Yosemite Avenue, at Lane Street; Lot 010 of Assessor’s Block 5418 (District 10) - Request for **Conditional Use Authorization**, pursuant to Planning Code Sections 151.1, 207, 210.4 and 303, to allow residential use within the M-1 Zoning District at a density ratio of one dwelling unit per 800 square feet of lot area and to allow off-street parking at a ratio of three parking spaces per four dwelling units for the project involving the construction of a 58-foot tall, five-story residential structure containing six dwelling units and four automobile parking spaces within a M-1 Zoning District at the 65-J Height and Bulk District. This action constitutes the Approval Action for the project for the purposes of CEQA, pursuant to San Francisco Administrative Code Section [31.04\(h\)](#).  
*Preliminary Recommendation: Approve with Conditions*  
 (Continued from Regular hearing on March 1, 2018)  
**(Proposed Continuance to May 24, 2018)**

SPEAKERS: None  
 ACTION: Continued to May 24, 2018  
 AYES: Fong, Hillis, Johnson, Koppel, Moore  
 NAYS: Richards  
 ABSENT: Melgar

## 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

4. [2017-016147CUA](#) (M. CHRISTENSEN: (415) 575-8742)  
855 BRANNAN STREET – northeastern side of 8<sup>th</sup> Street, between Brannan and Townsend Streets; Lot 001 in Assessor's Block 3783 (District 6) - Request for **Conditional Use Authorization**, pursuant to Planning Code Sections 303, 303.1, 843.45, and 843.46, to allow a Formula Retail Financial Services use (dba Wells Fargo) in a newly constructed retail space within the UMU (Urban Mixed Use) Zoning District and 68-X Height and Bulk District. This action constitutes the Approval Action for the project for the purposes of CEQA, pursuant to San Francisco Administrative Code Section [31.04\(h\)](#).  
*Preliminary Recommendation: Approve with Conditions*

SPEAKERS: None  
 ACTION: Approved with Conditions  
 AYES: Fong, Hillis, Johnson, Koppel, Melgar, Moore, Richards  
 MOTIONS: [20153](#)

## C. COMMISSION MATTERS

5. Commission Comments/Questions

**Commissioner Moore:**

I was glad to read in the paper that Marin Street may be available for the Flower Mart; I think that is a brave move given the push back and explanation we have heard. I think will help us much more strongly to really move forward on other matters.

**Commissioner Richards:**

So I was in Sacramento this week on Wednesday, I forget when they heard SB-827. I wanted to go see how sausage was made and boy did I see how sausage was made. Here we had a bill that would of impacted so many people, so many cities and we sit here every week over, what I would consider much, much less important issues; you know the five foot setback on a deck, we take three minutes of public comment generally unless there is a march on the Commission which we'll take two. So we have this bill in the Transportation and Housing Committee, there were 13 members, and the room was packed. We were in the largest room that there was available and what was really interesting was only two, what they call witnesses, were allowed to testify for two minutes each, two minutes each on each side and the rest of we peons, including the City of Los Angeles, the City of San Francisco and the other 200 people got five seconds. You could say your name, you could say your organization you are from and whether you oppose or you support it. So that was a real eye-opener for me, that there's virtually no public input, no public testimony at the state on such big bills. So, I did get a copy of the staff report for the bill, it's a real eye-opener; I think everybody should take a look at it. When you really look at it in the end, you could see practically every city in the state opposed the bill and a lot of them were there

including San Francisco to say so but, it's a real eye-opener. Which reminded me all this legislating that's going on, we're legislating everything, I saw this article and actually held on to it. It actually helps me understand the kind of meat that goes into the sausage mill called the Senate. Legislature exempts itself from most laws that apply to all of us up here. So we have public disclosure laws around our email, our calendar, everything, legislature doesn't. We have meetings, we can't hold a majority here, and four Commissioners can't talk about an item that's going to be heard because it violates the Brown Act; legislature doesn't have that. So, I think the legislature actually should start following all the rules that they pass to make everybody else follow them honestly; was a real eye-opener. I think Senator Weiner, who really is a good legislator and champion legislations and good government and transparency, should take some of their own legislative advice and follow their own rules.

San Francisco Magazine April 2018, a really good read. It's got "Can Big Tech Be Tamed?" and it's got all the fabulous tech CEOs here on the front climbing over the city like Godzilla and it's a really good article; it's got a few little mistakes but there's a really interesting quote by Mr. Ken Rich. He says, "However, there is another alternative to upzoning, one that would ease pressure on the city to up zone very widely. There are 60,000 units in the city's development pipeline of which only 12,000 are under construction." When we have the housing inventory report today, I'll like to talk about that. "Approximately 48,000 have been approved but not yet built. Ken Rich, the Director of Developments for the City's Office of Economic Work Force and Development, says, "Expediting the construction of these already approved units and also developing available spaces that does not require re-zoning would be more efficient than a massive up zoning effort." He says and I quote, "I'd rather focus on getting the parking lot on the west side which has a 40 foot height limit built up to 40 feet rather than fighting an extended battle about whether it should go to 60 feet." So I mean, that was a really telling thing. In the end, one of the take away of this article was big tech is driving a lot of job growth which is creating the inequality that we're seeing and it also needs to be a part of this solution. I also read today, it was in Bloomberg, cities that have the most income inequality; San Francisco was number two in the nation. Some cities that actually weren't even on the chart, like San Jose and some others moved way up the list. San Diego went from like number 99 to number 6; a lot of this is happening in the state.

Couple of other things; I understand SB-828 is going to be heard at Committee. From what I heard there's some amendments in it that's slipping in some rezoning/upzoning. I would really like staff to take a look at that and let us know what's in the bill; so it might not be kind of a son of 827 in disguise, another Trojan horse. The other one is in today's Chronicle, there's a point/counter point, Assemblyman David Chu verses another person about the reestablishment of redevelopment. I wasn't on this Commission when redevelopment existed; it went away, I think in 2011 and its AB-3037. What does that mean for us? Redevelopment? Does this mean eminent domain? Taking people's home away from them to build affordable housing? I honestly don't know.

Lastly, this week we have another article in the Bay Area section in the Chronicle about Hunter's Point; I'm going to be taking a tour there on Monday. There's a perception out in the public that nothing is getting built because of the toxic soil issue. When you actually look here there are things getting built, that there's different zones and there's already 150 housing units built, I think 200 under construction as per our housing inventory report and

I would really like to understand when I go out there Monday what the toxicity of the soil doing in terms of time lines and the delay of these housing because I know it's a significant number and that's 60,000 that Ken Rich mentioned that I keep mentioning. So a lot's going on, thank you.

**Commissioner Moore:**

Just a comment on the Shipyard, construction is moving extremely fast. The project looks fantastic and you'll be very surprised about its high quality. It's really a fine project.

**D. DEPARTMENT MATTERS**

**6. Director's Announcements**

**Director John Rahaim:**

Just to -- on the state bills, we're happy to kind of give you an update on the ones that have not been delayed. 828 is coming up soon as well, so we'll -- staff has been looking at that. On AB-3037, I think this is on its early stages. It does recreate redevelopment in something like its previous form with the idea that you'd build in some of the protections that needed to happen that were part of the reason that redevelopment was eliminated to begin with five years ago or seven years ago now. But at any rate, we will keep you informed on that. I think it's less detailed at this point, it's still somewhat conceptual, but it's something we will keep monitoring and at the appropriate time have a hearing and because 827 was not supported by the Committee, we've canceled next week's hearing on that as well, so just to remind everyone and for the public to know that SB-827 that was to be heard here next week is no longer on the calendar. Thank you.

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

**LAND USE COMMITTEE:**

- **180190 Planning Code - Lower Polk Street Alcohol Restricted Use District.** Sponsor: Peskin. Staff: Starr. Item 3

At this week's Land Use Committee hearing, the Committee heard Supervisor Peskin's ordinance that would extend the Lower Polk Alcohol Restricted Use District for another 5 years. Commissioners you heard this item on March 29, 2018 and voted to recommend approval with modifications. Your modifications included:

1. Replace the one year abandonment period with an 18 month abandonment period.
2. Amend the Ordinance to revise the January 1, 2018 date so that the new exception to abandonment provision can be used by the Hemlock Tavern; and
3. Revise the ordinance so that the footnote for Bar uses added to the Polk Street NCD table specifically identifies the Lower Polk Street RUD.

During the land use hearing Supervisor Peskin made a motion to amend the ordinance to add the recommendation 2 and 3 from Commission's t, but did not extend the abandonment period to 18 months from 1 year. Only one person spoke during public comment, a representative from the Lower Polk Neighborhood, who was in support of

the ordinance. After closing public comment, the Committee voted to forward the amended ordinance to the Full Board with a positive recommendation.

**FULL BOARD:**

- **180179 Appeal of Determination of Exemption from Environmental Review- 590 Leland Avenue.** Staff: Pollack.

At the Full Board this week, the Board rejected an appeal for the project located at 590 Leland Avenue. This project proposes to demolish an existing church building, subdivide the lot into five lots, and construct five single-family homes, one on each lot. Commissioners, you heard this item on January 18, 2018 as a discretionary review hearing, and voted to take DR and approve the project.

The appellant appealed the Categorical Exemption on the grounds that 1) the biological resources assessment was inaccurate and incomplete since it did not identify the existence of sensitive species on the site and sensitive rare habitat across the street 2) the loss of views from public open space, 3) Safety Issues due to interference with sightline from nearby parks, 4) Loss of ADA Accessible Open space 5) Shadows on the adjacent park; and 6) incomplete analysis of best use of site.

Supervisor Cohen had several questions for Staff which covered pretty much every item brought up by the appellant. Staff adroitly answered each question to the Supervisors satisfaction. In the end, Supervisor Cohen came to the conclusion that the CEQA analysis was sufficient and then made a motion to deny the appeal and uphold the project approval. The motion passed unanimously.

**BOARD OF APPEALS:****Corey Teague, Acting Zoning Administrator:**

I'm here to provide a report of last night's Board of Appeals hearing. They did meet last night and considered one case of interest to this Commission as has been well publicized, there has been much public debate since the events in Charlottesville, Virginia regarding the potential removal of the Early Days Sculpture that is part of the Pioneer Square Monument in the Fulton Street right of way between the Public Library and the Asian Art Museum. The San Francisco Arts Commission voted unanimously on March 5<sup>th</sup> of this year to remove the sculpture stating that its depiction of the degradation and genocide of Native American people relies upon stereotypes which are now universally viewed as disrespectful, misleading and racist. On February 21<sup>st</sup> of this year, the Historic Preservation Commission held a public hearing with full attendance from all Commissioners and found that the proposal was appropriate for and consistent with the purpose of Article 10 and that it met the standards of both Article 10 and the Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation, and so the HPC unanimously approved the Certificate of Appropriateness with the following conditions: First, that upon completion of the project, any documentation that is completed as part of the removal and storage of the Early Days Sculpture should be forwarded to the Planning Department to be added to the administrative record for the case, and second that a plaque should be installed at the site of the Early Days Sculpture to explain its removal. The Certificate of Appropriateness was appealed to the Board of Appeals and the appellant made numerous claims regarding the Arts Commission standing to seek the COA in the first place, First amendment violations, inadequate CEQA review, and the impact of removing the statue on the larger Pioneer

Monument and Civic Center Landmark District overall. After presentations from all parties, the Board of Appeals conducted a short deliberation and asked no questions of Planning Department staff. They then voted unanimously to grant the Appeal on the grounds that the Historic Preservation Commission acted incorrectly because it was inconsistent with their typical review of such cases, and that the project did not satisfy Standard #2 of the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for rehabilitation. Because the Arts Commission was a party to the Appeal, they do have a right to file for a rehearing request within ten days. Thank you.

**Commissioner Melgar:**

I just have procedural questions about the last item that you described. Can you tell us what happens now and what the role of the Planning Department would be?

**Corey Teague, Acting Zoning Administrator:**

Well at this point, the Historic Preservation Commission issued the Certificate of Appropriateness which was required to make this alteration within the Landmark District. Since the Appeal was upheld at this point that decision is reversed. Within ten days of an Appeal decision, a party to the Appeal can request -- make a rehearing request for the Board of Appeals. Essentially, they need to make a case that there was some information that was not available or provided at that hearing that could have impacted the outcome or that there would be manifest injustice if this outcome stands. And so if they request that rehearing, at that time, they will only be determining should there be a new hearing, not determining the merits of the case itself. So if they are successful in the rehearing request, which is a fairly high bar, then there would be basically a brand-new hearing on the original appeal. Our department, we staff the Board of Appeals for any decisions that are made by the department or the Planning Commission or the HPC, so we would continue in that role.

**Commissioner Melgar:**

So if there were -- if the rehearing is not granted because it's a pretty high bar, then what happens?

**Corey Teague, Acting Zoning Administrator:**

Well, I think they'd have to re-assess it from a preservation perspective and that's really more of a question for our Preservation Staff. If they determine that the Certificate of Appropriateness was not appropriate as issued then they'll have to explore if there are ways to modify that request in a way that would be appropriate or if there are other options available to them.

**Commissioner Melgar:**

But the two parties or the two different sides of the parties in the Appeal, can they push it further or this is it for that process in terms of the appeals?

**Corey Teague, Acting Zoning Administrator:**

Yeah. For this appeal, for this C of A, the Arts Commission as a party to the appeal, because they were the applicant to the C of A, representing the City, they can request the rehearing. If that is denied then, the appeal will stand and the C of A that was granted will basically be nullified.

**Vice-President Melgar:**

Okay. Thank you.

**Corey Teague, Acting Zoning Administrator:**

Sure.

**Commissioner Moore:**

In the course of listening to it I have lost my thread. Mr. Teague could you just simply tell me, is this thing going to stay or go?

**Corey Teague, Acting Zoning Administrator:**

I'm sorry. Could you repeat the last part?

**Commissioner Moore:**

Would you please tell us if the sculpture is going to stay or go?

**Corey Teague, Acting Zoning Administrator:**

The C of A was required to remove it, so without the C of A or some alternate determination from the Historic Preservation Commission that would allow it to be removed. My assumption is that it would have to stay without such authorization. Again, Preservation staff would be more appropriate to address what other options there may be for the project through the HPC if the C of A is ultimately nullified.

**Commissioner Moore:**

Does this type of ruling hold for all states and all cities across the country or just for San Francisco? Because in other cities where there were controversial monuments of the past they were just gone. Is this in particular tied to CEQA and Historical Preservation rules for the state of California?

**Corey Teague, Acting Zoning Administrator:**

I do know that for the removal of this sculpture it did require the Arts Commission to act. They have charter and administrative code authority and responsibilities that must be followed to remove public art. They took that step at their hearing in March and they unanimously voted to remove it. Because this statue is part of the Pioneer Monument which is within the larger Civic Center Landmark District, there is a certain amount of historic preservation review that is required beyond even just CEQA review. It was categorically exempt in terms of CEQA review, but because of the requirement of the Article 10 it does require the C of A from the Historic Preservation Commission to alter that monument within a Landmark District.

**Commissioner Moore:**

Thank you for explaining that, I think the public who does not understand the subtlety to see it as a moral push back to what's being ask for; however other rules comes into play, it becomes a complicated discussion. I wish somebody would sometimes give the public insight of what it takes to just remove it. It's not just saying we acknowledge that something was wrong in the past but there is a lot more to make it happen. So thank you for explaining that.

**Commissioner Richards:**

Question for Mr. Teague and also, maybe, for the city attorney. If an individual had a decision made by the Board of Appeals and they didn't agree with it. Is there a judicial remedy they could seek beyond Board of Appeals like file a court case? Can the city sue itself? Can the Arts Commission sue the --- seriously is there another avenue beside it stays?

**Kate Stacy, City Attorney:**

It has been done before, it is very infrequently done that one arm of the city sues another arm of the city. There may be members of the public who are interested in suing that would take a petition for Writ of Mandate which is the pretty typical vehicle to sue the city.

**Commissioner Richards:**

Does the individual have standing? Somebody who feels strongly about this in the public, could they, because they didn't have any part of any of this, actually step in and file a court case?

**Kate Stacy, City Attorney:**

Typically there's a requirement to exhaust your administrative remedies, which means that the individual who wants to sue needs to have appeared before the governmental body and express the argument. There are certainly other legal vehicles where that may not be a requirement, I can't give you an exhaustive answer, but typically when an individual or organization sues the city through the administration Writ of Mandate process there is a requirement that they have made their argument through the city before taking the city to court. This is somewhat an unusual situation because it's two different departments with different kinds of authority or three different departments with different kinds of authority over the same permit.

**Commissioner Melgar:**

Thank you very much for explaining that process to us. I gotta say that I feel really strongly about this and I don't see a subtlety in this in terms of the public. I think it's wrong and as a city we should not be second guessing the removal of a work of art that clearly is problematic and racist and depicts a very problematic relationship to our native population. So I personally plan on contacting my fellow Commissioners on appeals, but I think that this is something that should be explained to the public and our role in Planning to the public as well. Thank you.

**HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION:**

**Jonas P. Ionin, Commission Secretary:**

Just prior to the Board of Appeals action, the Historic Preservation Commission did meet and did act on several other items that may be of interest to the Planning Commission. They approved a Major Permit to Alter to modify 125 Stockton Street or the Macy's Men Store that will becoming before you next week so you'll see that project; but essentially changing the skin and opening up the building. In addition, they initiated landmark designation for the Arthur H. Coleman Medical Center on Third Street that provided healthcare to African-American citizens and residents of the Bayview District. They additionally adopted recommendations for approval for individual Landmark Designations for the New Pullman Hotel, the Piledrivers Bridge and Structural Ironworkers Local No. 77 Union Hall, as well as, Hotel Utah. Finally, it may be of interest to the Planning Commission

is they did adopt a recommendation for approval of a Landmark District Designation for the Clyde and Crooks Warehouse District.

## E. GENERAL 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. Each member of the public may address the Commission for up to three minutes.

SPEAKER: Georgia Schuttish – Curtailing global warming with trees  
 Margaret Gund – 430 Main design  
 Speaker – Justice  
 Cynthia Montes – 430 Main  
 Adam Massery – Air and light  
 Gustavo Leo – Synergy with Bay crest  
 Bruce Bowen – 3790 21<sup>st</sup> Street  
 Speaker – 214 States  
 Peter Cohen – Housing pipeline

## 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.

8. [2018-000681PCA](#) (A. STARR: (415) 558-6362)  
HOURS OF OPERATION FOR LIMITED NONCONFORMING USES – **Planning Code Amendment** initiated by the Planning Commission on March 8, 2018 to amend the Planning Code to allow limited nonconforming uses in specified zoning districts to operate between the hours of 10:00 p.m. and 12:00 a.m. with Conditional Use authorization; affirming the Planning Department’s determination under the California Environmental Quality Act; making findings of consistency with the General Plan and the eight priority policies of Planning Code, Section 101.1; and adopting findings of public convenience, necessity, and welfare under Planning Code, Section 302.  
*Preliminary Recommendation: Approve*

SPEAKERS: = Aaron Starr – Staff report  
 ACTION: Approved  
 AYES: Hillis, Johnson, Koppel, Melgar, Moore, Richards  
 ABSENT: Fong  
 RESOLUTIONS: [20154](#)

9. [2018-001968PCA](#) (A. BUTKUS: (415) 575-9129)  
LEGITIMIZATION AND RE-ESTABLISHMENT OF CERTAIN SELF-STORAGE USES – **Planning Code Amendment** to allow the owner of premises leased to the City and County of San Francisco for a public safety-related use to resume a pre-existing Self-Storage use after the

City vacates the property without regard to whether that Self-Storage use was established with benefit of permit; affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act; making findings of consistency with the General Plan and the eight priority policies of Planning Code, Section 101.1; and adopting findings of public necessity, convenience, and general welfare under Planning Code, Section 302.

*Preliminary Recommendation: Approve with Modifications*

SPEAKERS: = Audrey Butkus – Staff report  
+ John Updike – Department of Real Estate presentation  
ACTION: Approved with Modifications  
AYES: Fong, Hillis, Johnson, Koppel, Melgar, Moore, Richards  
RESOLUTION: [20155](#)

10. [2017-014297PCA](#) (D. BROSKY: (415) 575-8727)  
**PLANNING CODE CORRECTIONS ORDINANCE – Planning Code Amendment** initiated by the Planning Commission on March 8, 2018 to amend the Planning Code in order to correct errors and update outdated references; affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act; making findings of consistency with the General Plan and the eight priority policies of Planning Code, Section 101.1; and adopting findings of public necessity, convenience, and general welfare under Planning Code, Section 302.

*Preliminary Recommendation: Approve*

SPEAKERS: = David Brosky – Staff report  
= Peter Cohen – “Median” to “market” benchmark  
+ Amy Chen  
ACTION: Approved as amended by Staff, including specifying “median market” for future analysis purposes.  
AYES: Fong, Hillis, Johnson, Koppel, Melgar, Moore, Richards  
RESOLUTION: 20156

11. [1996.0013CWP](#) (S. AMBATI: (415) 575-9183)  
**2017 HOUSING INVENTORY REPORT – Informational Presentation** - Announcing the publication of the *2017 Housing Inventory*. This report is the 48th in the series and describes San Francisco's housing supply. *Housing Inventory* data accounts for new housing construction, demolitions, and alterations in a consistent format for the analysis of housing production trends. Net housing unit gains are reported citywide, by zoning classification, and by planning district. Other areas covered include affordable housing production, condominium conversions, and changes to the residential hotel stock. In addition, a list of major housing projects completed and approved for construction in 2017 is provided. Report is available for the public at the Planning Department and on the website.

*Preliminary Recommendation: None – Informational*

SPEAKERS: = Svetha Ambati – Staff presentation  
= Teresa Ojeda – Housing Pipeline Dashboard report  
+ Corey Smith – Short term and long term housing production success  
+ Peter Cohen – Data analysis significance  
= Sue Hestor – Righteous anger

ACTION: None - Informational

12. [2015-018094CWP](#) (D. JOHNSON: (415) 575-8735)  
**CONNECTSF** – A proposed Resolution is before the Commission to **Endorse the 2065 Vision** developed. ConnectSF is a multi-agency collaborative process to build an effective, equitable, and sustainable transportation system for San Francisco’s future. The Planning Department’s partners in this program are the Municipal Transportation Agency, Countywide Transportation Authority, and Office of Economic and Workforce Development. Through a yearlong community outreach and scenario planning process, a 50-year Vision of San Francisco’s future was developed to guide the development of the City’s long-range transportation policies and plans. This includes a major update to the Planning Department’s General Plan Transportation Element. Public comment on the draft Vision closed on March 1, 2018, and a revised version was published on March 22, 2018.  
*Preliminary Recommendation: Adopt a Resolution Endorsing the Plan*

SPEAKERS: = Tam Tran – Staff presentation  
 +Ted Olson – Transit to keep pace with housing growth  
 ACTION: Adopted a Resolution Endorsing the Plan  
 AYES: Fong, Hillis, Johnson, Koppel, Melgar, Moore, Richards  
 RESOLUTION: [20157](#)

- 13a. [2015-001650CUA](#) (C. MAY: (415) 575-9087)  
**3042A CALIFORNIA STREET** – north side of California Street between Lyon and Baker Streets, Lot 015 in Assessor’s Block 1023 (District 1) – Request for **Conditional Use Authorization** pursuant to Planning Code Sections 303 and 317 to legalize the previously demolished and partially reconstructed two-story, two-unit dwelling at the rear of the subject property within a RH-2 (Residential-House, Two-Family) Zoning District and 40-X Height and Bulk District. This action constitutes the Approval Action for the project for the purposes of CEQA, pursuant to San Francisco Administrative Code Section [31.04](#)(h).  
*Preliminary Recommendation: Approve with Conditions*

SPEAKERS: = Chris May – Staff report  
 + Rodrigo Santos – Project presentation  
 - Courtney Clarkson – Illegal construction  
 ACTION: After hearing and closing public comment; Continued to May 17, 2018 with direction from the Commission.  
 AYES: Fong, Hillis, Johnson, Koppel, Melgar, Moore, Richards

- 13b. [2015-001650VAR](#) (C. MAY: (415) 575-9087)  
**3042A CALIFORNIA STREET** – north side of California Street between Lyon and Baker Streets, Lot 015 in Assessor’s Block 1023 (District 1) - Request for **Variances** from the rear yard requirements of Planning Code Section 134, for the usable open space requirements of Planning Code Section 135, and for the dwelling unit exposure requirements of Planning Code Section 140 to legalize the previously-demolished and partially reconstructed two-story, two-unit residential building at the rear of the subject property. The project site is located in a RH-2 (Residential-House, Two-Family) Zoning District and 40-X Height and Bulk District.

SPEAKERS: Same as item 13a.

**ACTION:** After hearing and closing public comment; Continued to May 17, 2018 with direction from the Commission.

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

14. [2017-014841CUA](#) (J. HORN: (415) 575-6925)  
655 ALVARADO STREET – side of Alvarado Street between Diamond and Castro Streets, Lot 028C in Assessor’s Block 2803 (District 8) – Request for **Conditional Use Authorization** pursuant to Planning Code Sections 303 and 317, to legalize the tantamount to demolition of an existing 2,737 square foot, two-story-over-basement single-family home and the permit a new three-story-over-two-basement-levels single-family home. The project site is located within a RH-2 (Residential, House, Two-Family) Zoning District and 40-X Height and Bulk District. This action constitutes the Approval Action for the project for the purposes of CEQA, pursuant to San Francisco Administrative Code Section [31.04](#)(h).  
*Preliminary Recommendation: Approve with Modifications and Conditions*  
 (Continued from Regular hearing on February 22, 2018)  
**NOTE: After hearing and closing public comment; Continued to April 19, 2018 by a vote of +5 -0 (Fong absent).**

**SPEAKERS:** Speaker – Would not like it continued

**ACTION:** Continued to May 24, 2018

**AYES:** Fong, Hillis, Johnson, Koppel, Moore

**NAYS:** Richards

**ABSENT:** Melgar

15. [2017-014466CUA](#) (V. FLORES: (415) 575-9173)  
100 CHURCH STREET – at Duboce Street; Lot 001 of Assessor’s Block 3537 (District 8) - Request for **Conditional Use Authorization**, pursuant to Planning Code Sections [303](#), [303.1](#), [121.2](#), and [764](#) to allow a change of use from a vacant retail store to a Formula Retail Gym (d.b.a. CorePower Yoga) in the existing commercial space greater than 4,000 square feet in size within the Upper Market NCT (Neighborhood Commercial Transit District) and 40-X Height and Bulk Districts. This action constitutes the Approval Action for the project for the purposes of CEQA, pursuant to San Francisco Administrative Code Section [31.04](#)(h).  
*Preliminary Recommendation: Approve with Conditions*

**SPEAKERS:** = Veronica Flores – Staff report  
 + Stephanie Rubinstein – Project presentation

**ACTION:** Approved with Conditions

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

**MOTION:** [20158](#)

## 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. [2017-001225DRP-02](#) (E. SAMONSKY: (415) 575-9112)

701 HAMPSHIRE STREET – south east corner of the intersection of 19th and Hampshire Streets; Lot 018 in Assessor’s Block 4078 (District 8) - Request for **Discretionary Review** of Building Permit Application No. 2017.0124.7741, proposing to convert the ground floor garage space into two accessory dwelling units and construct a vertical addition (fourth floor) of approximately 1,051 square feet (vertical addition would add living space to the existing units #4 and #5 on the third floor), and interior and exterior remodel of the existing six-unit apartment building within a RH-2 (Residential, House, Two-Family) Zoning District and 40-X Height and Bulk District.

Staff Analysis: Abbreviated Discretionary Review

*Preliminary Recommendation: Do not take Discretionary Review and approve as revised*

- SPEAKERS:
- = Marcelle Boudreaux – Staff report
  - Jennifer Fieber – DR No. 1 presentation
  - Speaker – DR No. 2 presentation
  - Linda Contego – Objection
  - Speaker – Loss of parking
  - Speaker – Negative impacts
  - Speaker – Negative impacts
  - Eddy Steele – Solidarity with tenants
  - + Christina Tran – Project presentation
  - + Project Architect – Context and height
  - + David Moss – Support
  - Trevor Somers – Rebuttal

ACTION: After hearing and closing public comment; Continued to June 21, 2018 with direction from the Commission.

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

ADJOURNMENT – 5:33 PM

ADOPTED MAY 3, 2018