Dear Planning Commission President Melgar,

I am writing to inform that Union Square Business Improvement District is highly support of 146 Geary's conditional use application to convert the third floor to office. Attached is our formal letter of support.

The item is be to be heard at today's Commission hearing. I will be in attendance speaking in favor of the project.

Thank you,
Karin Flood
Dear Planning Commission and Staff,

I’m writing to support the approval of 65 Ocean Ave. This is a well-designed project that takes advantage of the HOME-SF program to expand access to affordable housing in a way that maximally addresses our housing shortage. Building new homes for all income levels near transit is just what we need to be doing to make our neighborhood more accessible, diverse, and healthy.

I do respect the efforts of neighbors who have concerns about this project, who are motivated by the goal of making the neighborhood more inclusive and protecting our most vulnerable residents, even though I disagree with their understanding of this particular project and its impacts. I think the best way for the planning commission to respond to their concerns is to prioritize opening up wealthy, exclusionary neighborhoods elsewhere on the south and west of the city so that all neighborhoods share in the challenges and opportunities of providing new homes. The commission should study this and also use its discretion to expedite approval of new housing in neighborhoods that have seen little change to the built environment amidst the housing crisis.

Zack Subin
192 Caine Ave
P.S. I bike by this location on my way to work and would love to see it contribute to the neighborhood with more people on the street and on bikes and supporting the neighborhood restaurants and businesses on Mission Ave.

Zack Subin
San Francisco, CA 94112

subin@post.harvard.edu | subin@berkeley.edu | zachary.subin@ethree.com
https://www.facebook.com/zsubin
https://twitter.com/zack_subin
https://www.linkedin.com/in/zachary-subin-9b6435bb/
Good morning Honorable Members of the Planning Commission. I have been a resident of San Francisco for over 70+ years. I'm sorry I can not be at your tomorrows meeting for item #14 (on your agenda). But trust me I'm in full support for this most wonderful project and can't wait for it to happen. The Candlestick Point project. This project/plan has been around for too long. I have had a wonderful chance to follow this since early 2016 (CCII). I believe this Amended Document does a good job and needs your approval @ this phase.

Having said that, I too would like your approval. These delays all to often cause the sponsor/s additional funds with construction cost, etc. and or just plain move on. After your approval I would like to see this project be put on a fast track thru the planning process. Further delays may impact this project. We need this housing. It is a wonderful site for such a great master plan. I do not want to loose this PROJECT. But mostly it's for our future generation. Sorry for the rambling email and hope this makes some sense.

If anyone has any comments and or concerns to my rambling email, please reach
back to me with your questions and or concerns. Please share this email as needed and part of the projects documents.

--------------------------------------All the ----DHsf--------------------------------------

Dennis Hong
Dear SF Planning Department Commissioners and Officials,

My name is Dr. Alex Gurn. I am a resident of Laurel Heights and the father of a nine-year-old child who attends San Francisco Public Montessori School, located at Jackson & Webster Street. For the past three years, I have served as the fundraising chair for the school and PTA. I am also a small business owner of an education research firm in San Francisco.

I am writing you express my objection to a planned construction of 10 5G antennae at 2412 Clay Street.

Please see my attached letter. I also plan to attend the public hearing tomorrow.

Sincerely,
Alex Gurn
--
Alex Gurn, PhD
Research Associate
Jonas P. Ionin,  
Director of Commission Affairs

Planning Department|City & County of San Francisco  
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, CA 94103  
Direct: 415-558-6309|Fax: 415-558-6409

jonas.ionin@sfgov.org  
www.sfplanning.org

From: Ben Libbey <ben@yimbylaw.org>  
Sent: Wednesday, October 23, 2019 4:53 PM  
Cc: Flores, Veronica (CPC) <Veronica.Flores@sfgov.org>; CPC-Commissions Secretary  
<commissions.secretary@sfgov.org>  
Subject: 65 Ocean Ave Case No. 2016-00680ENV

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

10/23/2019

San Francisco Planning Commission  
1 Dr Carlton Goodlett Pl  
San Francisco, CA 94102

Veronica.Flores@sfgov.org; commissions секретary@sfgov.org;  
Via Email

Re: 65 Ocean Ave  
Case No. 2016-00680ENV

Dear San Francisco Planning Commission,

Yes In My Back Yard submits this letter to inform you that the San Francisco Planning Commission has an obligation to abide by all relevant state housing laws when evaluating the above captioned proposal, including the Housing Accountability Act (HAA).

California Government Code § 65589.5, the Housing Accountability Act, prohibits localities from denying housing development projects that are compliant with the locality’s zoning ordinance or general plan at the time the application was deemed complete, unless the locality can make findings that the proposed housing development...
would be a threat to public health and safety. The most relevant section is copied below:

(j) When a proposed housing development project complies with applicable, objective general plan and zoning standards and criteria, including design review standards, in effect at the time that the housing development project’s application is determined to be complete, but the local agency proposes to disapprove the project or to approve it upon the condition that the project be developed at a lower density, the local agency shall base its decision regarding the proposed housing development project upon written findings supported by substantial evidence on the record that both of the following conditions exist:

1. The housing development project would have a specific, adverse impact upon the public health or safety unless the project is disapproved or approved upon the condition that the project be developed at a lower density. As used in this paragraph, a "specific, adverse impact" means a significant, quantifiable, direct, and unavoidable impact, based on objective, identified written public health or safety standards, policies, or conditions as they existed on the date the application was deemed complete.

2. There is no feasible method to satisfactorily mitigate or avoid the adverse impact identified pursuant to paragraph (1), other than the disapproval of the housing development project or the approval of the project upon the condition that it be developed at a lower density.

The applicant proposes to demolish three existing buildings on the project site and to construct an approximately 55-foot-tall, 191,374-gross-square-foot building containing 193 dwelling units, a 5,942-gsf childcare facility, and basement-level garage with a total of 121 parking spaces.

The above captioned proposal is zoning compliant and general plan compliant, therefore, your local agency must approve the application, or else make findings to the effect that the proposed project would have an adverse impact on public health and safety, as described above.

Yes In My Back Yard is a 501(c)3 non-profit corporation, whose mission is to increase the accessibility and affordability of housing in California.

Sincerely,

Sonja Trauss
Secretary
Yes In My Back Yard
Dear President Melgar and Commissioners,

I live directly across the street from the proposed project at 463 Castro St (2019-012253DRP). I'm writing today because our process is broken and is being abused.

I received quite a bit of mail describing the project in minute detail complete with a whole oversized page dedicated to listing the myriad ways I could stop this project. Not a single mention of how to support this project or even general support for not leaving this storefront vacant.

The Castro has too many vacant storefronts and the request for review and the continuance are only adding delays while a would-be small business owner continues to pay rent. These delays add to the cost of establishing a business and deter other entrepreneurs from establishing new business in the city.

More egregiously, this DR was filed by a competitor! Businesses should not be allowed to dictate the rules governing themselves and their competitors, but for a few hundred dollars, the owner of the (at best mediocre) Gyro Xpress has incurred months of delays and thousands of dollars of rent on Flying Falafel.

This all too common sort of abuse of process is the epitome of late capitalism and must be reformed. We should not need to have a hearing on such an inconsequential change of use.

Finally, on the merits of the change of use, Mr Bulutogu is incorrect that there are too many limited restaurants in the area. In particular, there is a severe lack of vegetarian options in the Castro.
Sincerely,

Hoa Long Tam

466 Castro St. #B
San Francisco, CA 94114
Ms. Melgar,

At the request of Carolyn Lee, attached please find the project sponsor letter regarding the T-Mobile project located at 3501 Geary Blvd., Planning Case No. 2019-002758CUA.

Sincerely,

Julie Wilson
of this message and all attachments. Any unauthorized disclosure, use, distribution, or reproduction of this message or any attachments is prohibited and may be unlawful.
This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Jonas P. Ionin,
Director of Commission Affairs
Planning Department|City & County of San Francisco
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, CA 94103
Direct: 415-558-6309|Fax: 415-558-6409
jonas.ionin@sfgov.org
www.sfplanning.org

From: Sarah Wilson via ActionNetwork.org <info@sg.actionnetwork.org>
Sent: Monday, October 21, 2019 3:02 PM
To: CPC-Commissions Secretary <commissions.secretary@sfgov.org>
Subject: San Francisco Planning Commissioners: President Myrna Melgar, Vice President Joel Koppel, Commissioner Frank S. Fung, Commissioner Milicent A. Johnson, Commissioner Kathrin Moore, Commissioner Dennis Richards, Build Affordable Housing and Child Care at 65 Ocean Avenue.

San Francisco Planning Commissioners: President Myrna Melgar, Vice President Joel Koppel, Commissioner Frank S. Fung, Commissioner Milicent A. Johnson, Commissioner Kathrin Moore, Commissioner Dennis Richards,

38 people have signed a petition on Action Network telling you to Build Affordable Housing and Child Care at 65 Ocean Avenue.

Here is the petition they signed:

We are families with children who have attended The Crayon Box Spanish Immersion Preschool, which was located at 65 Ocean Avenue until a few years ago. We are asking you to make sure that any project you approve at 65 Ocean includes housing that is affordable to low-income Excelsior residents AND a long-term home for Crayon Box Preschool.

When a developer purchased the 65 Ocean property a few years ago, our
preschool had to move to a different site a few miles away. Now we have
learned that Presidio Bay Ventures plans to build housing at 65 Ocean and
allow Crayon Box to return to a ground-floor site there. We would love to see
our preschool return to its former site, but we are concerned about how this
proposed housing project will affect the surrounding neighborhood.

Development of high-end luxury rental housing in the Excelsior and nearby
neighborhoods is already increasing pressure on the people who live there. We
understand that 75% of the units in the proposed 65 Ocean development would
be rented out at market rate, which would make them totally inaccessible to the
many poor and working-class families who live in the district. A project that adds
so many market-rate units would also exacerbate the already alarming rise in
rents across the neighborhood. Additionally, we understand that most of the
units proposed for this project would be studios and one-bedroom apartments.
The Excelsior is the neighborhood with the highest proportion of families and
intergenerational households in San Francisco. These households will not fit
into a studio apartment.

We are concerned that allowing this development to go forward as proposed will
hurt the neighborhood and bring even further displacement of its residents.
***We call on you to make sure that any project that the Planning Commission
approves at 65 Ocean Avenue is a 100% affordable housing development,
where low-income Excelsior residents can afford the rent – and that it include a
ground floor space for the Crayon Box Preschool to return to and stay in long-
term.*** We know this can be done, just as a 100% affordable housing project
was approved at the former Valente Marini Perata funeral home site just a few
blocks away on Mission Street.

Commissioners, it is up to you to make sure that the 65 Ocean Avenue site can
serve families with young children and, at the same time, provide housing for
working-class families in the Excelsior and keep them from being pushed out of
the neighborhood.

Thank you for your consideration.

You can view each petition signer and the comments they left you in the attached PDF.

Thank you,

Sarah Wilson

---

Sent via Action Network, a free online toolset anyone can use to
organize. Click here to sign up and get started building an email list and
creating online actions today.
Action Network is an open platform that empowers individuals and groups to organize for progressive causes. We encourage responsible activism, and do not support using the platform to take unlawful or other improper action. We do not control or endorse the conduct of users and make no representations of any kind about them.

You can unsubscribe or update your email address or change your name and address by changing your subscription preferences here.
FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE:
Monday, October 21, 2019
Contact: Mayor’s Office of Communications, 415-554-6131

*** PRESS RELEASE ***
MAYOR LONDON BREED CELEBRATES GROUNDBREAKING OF JEFFERSON STREETSCAPE IMPROVEMENTS

This second phase of the streetscape design will create a safer, more inviting street for residents and visitors of the Fisherman’s Wharf area

San Francisco, CA — Mayor London N. Breed and Supervisor Aaron Peskin joined community leaders and City officials today for a ceremonial groundbreaking to mark the start of construction on the second phase of the Jefferson Streetscape Improvements Project, which will enhance pedestrian safety and beautify the popular Fisherman’s Wharf corridor.

The $16.3 million streetscape project runs along three blocks of Jefferson Street from Jones Street to Powell Street. The project includes numerous changes improving the experience for those walking or biking, including widened sidewalks, new lighting and landscaping, and expanded seating and bicycle parking. The street will also be narrowed and include textured paving to help calm traffic. The improvements support the vision set out in the Fisherman’s Wharf Public Realm Plan. The first phase of the project covered the two blocks of Jefferson
Street from Hyde Street to Jones Street and was completed in June 2013.

“We are excited to begin the next phase of these important changes to Jefferson Street to make this area safer, more inviting, and pedestrian focused,” said Mayor Breed. “Fisherman’s Wharf is a unique destination and this project will create a better street experience for locals and visitors from around the world.”

Construction of the project is managed by San Francisco Public Works and is anticipated to be completed by fall 2020. The project will be constructed in phases to minimize construction impacts in the neighborhood, starting with work focused at the intersection of Jefferson and Jones streets, followed by work along the north side of Jefferson, then along the south side of Jefferson.

“This is the culmination of over a decade of effort to ensure that Fisherman’s Wharf remains a vital economic engine and draw for locals and visitors from around the world,” said Supervisor Aaron Peskin. “Since 2006, we’ve cobbled together millions of public dollars to turn this into a model pedestrian promenade. The Wharf welcomes millions of visitors and workers every year who will finally see this last stretch of Jefferson Street become much safer and more beautiful.”

To make room for the safety improvements and widened sidewalks, parking along Jefferson Street between Jones and Powell Streets will be removed.

“We have worked closely with multiple City departments and with the community to design something that will truly benefit everyone who visits, works and lives in the area,” said Director of Public Works, Mohammed Nuru. “Not only will we create a safer street, there will be more room on the sidewalks to welcome more tourists to the neighborhood.”

The project is a multiagency collaboration involving San Francisco Public Works, the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA), San Francisco Public Utilities Commission, San Francisco Planning, the San Francisco County Transportation Authority and the Port of San Francisco.

“The Port of San Francisco is excited to work with our city and community partners to bring the vision and plans of the Fisherman’s Wharf Public Realm Plan to fruition,” said Elaine Forbes, Executive Director of the Port of San Francisco. “This project will make Fisherman’s Wharf more accessible and inviting for tourists and residents alike; solidifying its special place in San Francisco.”

Randall Scott, Executive Director of the Fisherman’s Wharf Community Benefit District, which has been instrumental in the re-envisioning of this important corridor said, “We look forward to working closely with Public Works and the community throughout this process and look forward to a safer and more welcoming Jefferson Street for all San Franciscans.”

“The Jefferson Streetscape Improvements Project elevates safety with specially designed pavement patterns and narrowed travel lanes, to promote traffic calming throughout the corridor,” said Tom Maguire, Interim Director of Transportation for the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency.

Starting today and continuing for the duration of construction, Muni’s E-Embarcadero and
F-Market and Wharves historic streetcars will turn back at Pier 39. A shuttle bus will operate in a loop to serve missed stops on the remaining four blocks.

The project is funded in part by the California State SB1 Gas Tax, the San Francisco Public Works’ General Fund for Streetscape and Paving Program, the SFMTA Transportation and Road Improvement General Obligation Bond, Prop K sales tax revenue, and the San Francisco Port’s General Fund.

Additional project information can be found at [www.sfpublicworks.org/jefferson](http://www.sfpublicworks.org/jefferson).
Jonas P. Ionin,
Director of Commission Affairs

Planning Department| City & County of San Francisco
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, CA 94103
Direct: 415-558-6309| Fax: 415-558-6409
jonas.ionin@sfgov.org
www.sfplanning.org

From: Sue Hestor <hestor@earthlink.net>
Sent: Friday, October 18, 2019 4:27 PM
To: Ionin, Jonas (CPC) <jonas.ionin@sfgov.org>; Myrna Melgar <melgar.myrna@gmail.com>; Silva, Christine (CPC) <christine.silva@sfgov.org>; Koppel, Joel (CPC) <joel.koppel@sfgov.org>; Kathrin Moore <Mooreurban@aol.com>; Fung, Frank (CPC) <frank.fung@sfgov.org>; Johnson, Milicent (CPC) <milicent.johnson@sfgov.org>; Richards, Dennis (CPC) <dennis.richards@sfgov.org>
Subject: How long is change for? And exactly who makes decision?

How long is change for? And exactly who makes decision?

Hestor

On 10/18/2019 4:21 PM, Ionin, Jonas (CPC) wrote:

This is not permanent.

Jonas P. Ionin,
Director of Commission Affairs

Planning Department| City & County of San Francisco
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, CA 94103
Direct: 415-558-6309| Fax: 415-558-6409
jonas.ionin@sfgov.org
www.sfplanning.org

From: Sue Hestor <hestor@earthlink.net>
Sent: Friday, October 18, 2019 4:11 PM
To: Ionin, Jonas (CPC) <jonas.ionin@sfgov.org>; Myrna Melgar <melgar.myrna@gmail.com>; Silva, Christine (CPC) <christine.silva@sfgov.org>; Koppel, Joel (CPC) <joel.koppel@sfgov.org>; Kathrin Moore <Mooreurban@aol.com>; Fung, Frank (CPC) <frank.fung@sfgov.org>; Johnson, Milicent (CPC) <milicent.johnson@sfgov.org>; Richards, Dennis (CPC) <dennis.richards@sfgov.org>
Subject: Permanent switch to END ? General Public Comment

Has there been a permanent change so that Gen Pub Comment will regularly be at the END of the agenda?

Assume that this was decision of Plan Comm officers. Correct?

Sue Hestor

On 10/18/2019 3:58 PM, Ionin, Jonas (CPC) wrote:

Yes, this Agenda is correct. The Commission Rules & Regs do not require any particular order of business.

Jonas P. Ionin,
Director of Commission Affairs
When did the Commission vote to amend its Rules to eliminate General Public Comment at the start of Commission hearing. And put it only at the end?

Is this calendar incorrect?

Sue Hestor

On 10/18/2019 3:40 PM, San Francisco Planning Department wrote:

Planning Commission Public Hearing

Thank you for your interest in subscribing to the San Francisco Planning Commission’s public hearing announcement.

Please click on the attached link to see the items scheduled for the upcoming hearing:

**October 24, 2019, Regular Meeting Agenda**

1:00 p.m.

City Hall, One Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place Room 400

General information about our public hearings, accessible meeting information, and language assistance can also be found by visiting https://sf-planning.org/planning-commission.

For questions, please contact Chanbory Son at chanbory.son@sfgov.org.
Jonas P. Ionin,
Director of Commission Affairs

Planning Department/City & County of San Francisco
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, CA 94103
Direct: 415-558-6309/Fax: 415-558-6409
jonas.ionin@sfgov.org
www.sfplanning.org

From: spike <spikekahn@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, October 18, 2019 7:06 PM
To: Sue Hestor <hestor@earthlink.net>
Cc: Ionin, Jonas (CPC) <jonas.ionin@sfgov.org>; Myrna Melgar <melgar.myrna@gmail.com>; Silva, Christine (CPC) <christine.silva@sfgov.org>; Koppel, Joel (CPC) <joel.koppel@sfgov.org>; Kathrin Moore <Mooreurban@aol.com>; Fung, Frank (CPC) <frank.fung@sfgov.org>; Johnson, Milicent (CPC) <milicent.johnson@sfgov.org>; Richards, Dennis (CPC) <dennis.richards@sfgov.org>; USM Member Orgs <usm-member-orgs@googlegroups.com>
Subject: Re: Permanent switch to END ? General Public Comment

I strongly object to scheduling public comment to only be heard at the end of the planning commission meetings. The public cannot guess when that time for them to participate will be each week, missing work and time with their families. I do support allowing the public a second opportunity to speak at the end of the hearing, to allow working San Franciscans an opportunity to speak.

On Fri, Oct 18, 2019, 4:11 PM Sue Hestor <hestor@earthlink.net> wrote:

Has there been a permanent change so that Gen Pub Comment will regularly be at the END of the agenda?
Assume that this was decision of Plan Comm officers. Correct?

Sue Hestor

On 10/18/2019 3:58 PM, Ionin, Jonas (CPC) wrote:

Sue,
Yes, this Agenda is correct. The Commission Rules & Regs do not require any particular order of business.

Jonas P. Ionin,
Director of Commission Affairs

Planning Department/City & County of San Francisco
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, CA 94103
Direct: 415-558-6309/Fax: 415-558-6409
jonas.ionin@sfgov.org
www.sfplanning.org

From: Sue Hestor <hestor@earthlink.net>
Sent: Friday, October 18, 2019 3:53 PM
To: Myrna Melgar <melgar.myrna@email.com>; Ionin, Jonas (CPC) <jonas.ionin@sfgov.org>; Silva, Christine (CPC) <christine.silva@sfgov.org>; Koppel, Joel (CPC) <joel.koppel@sfgov.org>
Subject: General Public Comment - MOVED TO END OF CALENDAR?

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.
When did the Commission vote to amend its Rules to eliminate General Public Comment at the start of Commission hearing. And put it only at the end?

Is this calendar incorrect?

Sue Hestor

On 10/18/2019 3:40 PM, San Francisco Planning Department wrote:

Planning Commission Public Hearing

Thank you for your interest in subscribing to the San Francisco Planning Commission's public hearing announcement.

Please click on the attached link to see the items scheduled for the upcoming hearing:

**October 24, 2019, Regular Meeting Agenda**

1:00 p.m.
City Hall, One Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place Room 400

General information about our public hearings, accessible meeting information, and language assistance can also be found by visiting [https://sf-planning.org/planning-commission](https://sf-planning.org/planning-commission).

For questions, please contact Chanbory Son at [chanbory.son@sfgov.org](mailto:chanbory.son@sfgov.org).

Please Do Not Reply to this automated email

---------------------------

SUBSCRIBER SERVICES: Manage Preferences  |  Unsubscribe  |  Help

QUESTIONS?  [Contact us](mailto:planningnews@sfgov.org) or email planningnews@sfgov.org
Dear Planning Commissioners, et al.:

**ISSUE**: The PC agenda for the upcoming 10/24/2019 meeting removes the early “Public Comments – 15 minutes” item of the agenda.

**BACKGROUND**: Back in 2015, Planning Commission (PC) President Fong appointed a committee (C. Johnson, K. Moore, & D. Richards) to work on changes to its Rules & Regulations (R&Rs)* which are posted today as it was passed by the PC on July 2, 2015.

**REQUEST FOR CLARIFICATIONS**: 

---

*San Francisco Planning Department
1. “Section 9. Order of Business” shows 10 items for “Order of Business” for the PC agenda:
   1. Roll Call
   2. Consent Calendar
   3. Commission Matters
   4. Action Item List
   5. Department Matters
   6. Public Comment – 15 Minutes
   7. Regular Calendar
   8. Discretionary Review Calendar
   9. Public Comment
   10. Adjournment

   The President (or Chair) may change the order of business as determined necessary for the Planning Commission to conduct its business effectively.

   While the *order* of the items *may* be changed, do the R&Rs allow any of the 10 items to be removed from the agenda?

   If so, who has the authority to remove agenda items? What is the process, if any, on how items on the PC agenda “outline” are removed?

2. “Article V – Amendments”:
   Section 1. These Rules and Regulations may be amended by the Commission at any Regular Meeting by a majority vote following a public hearing, providing that the amendment has been calendared for hearing for at least ten days.

   What role does the PC have in changes to the R&Rs? Would removal of one of the 10 items in the “order of business” be considered an amendment?

3. While I was reading the R&Rs, I also noticed that in Section 9, Item #4 (“Action Item List”), is an item that no longer is seen on recent PC agendas. Has it ever been since the R&Rs were adopted? Would that be considered an amendment?

   Perhaps the Board of Supervisors has no say on changes to the PC’s R&Rs but in case they do, I copy them.

   Thanks in advance for the clarifications.
   Rose H.

* <<<<< REFERENCE >>>>>

https://sfplanning.org/resource/rules-regulations-san-francisco-planning-commission

RULES & REGULATIONS - SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING
ARTICLE I – NAME

Section 1. The Name of this Commission shall be "SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING COMMISSION."

ARTICLE II – OFFICERS AND APPOINTMENTS

Section 1. Officers. The Officers of this Commission shall consist of a President and a Vice President. The President and Vice President shall be members of the Commission, and shall be elected at the first Regular Meeting of the Commission held on or after the 15th day of January of each year; or at a subsequent Meeting, the date of which shall be fixed by the Commission at the first Regular Meeting on or after the 15th day of January each year. They shall hold office for one year or until their successors are elected.

Section 2. Election. The presiding officer takes public comment on the agenda item. Then the presiding officer requests nominations for the office from the members of the body. No second is required under Roberts' Rules of Order. When no additional nominations are offered, the presiding officer closes the nomination. The Commission then votes on the nomination in the order they were received. The first candidate to receive a majority of the votes is elected to the office.

The President and Vice President shall not both be members of the commission appointed by the Mayor or President of the Board of Supervisors. (If one is a Mayoral appointee, the other position must be held by a member appointed by the President of the Board of Supervisors).

Section 3. Planning Director. The Planning Director shall hold office at the pleasure of the Commission and shall be qualified by training and experience to be the administrative and technical head of the San Francisco Planning Department and of all activities under the jurisdiction of the Planning Commission. An annual performance
evaluation by the full Commission may be convened in closed session.

Section 4. Commission Secretary. The Commission at any Regular or Special Meeting may appoint a Commission Secretary who shall hold office at the pleasure of the Commission.

ARTICLE III – DUTIES OF OFFICERS

Section 1. President. The President shall preside at all meetings of the Commission, shall appoint all Committees and their Chairs, and shall perform all other duties necessary or incidental to the office. The President shall attend all Meetings of bodies of which, by the Charter, he or she is made an ex-officio member, or shall designate the Planning Director or any member of the Commission to attend such Meetings in the place and stead of the President.

Section 2. Vice President. In the event of the absence or inability to act of the President, the Vice President shall take the place and perform the duties of the President. In the event of absence or inability to act of both the President and Vice President, the remaining members of the Commission shall elect one of their members to act temporarily as President, by a majority vote of the remaining Commissioners.

ARTICLE IV – MEETINGS

Section 1. Regular Meetings. Regular Meetings of the Commission shall be open and public and shall be held each Thursday of each month except in any month where there are five (5) Thursdays. Where there are five (5) Thursdays in a month, the fifth Thursday of the month shall be cancelled, unless otherwise adopted as part of the Hearing Schedule. All Regular Meetings of the San Francisco Planning Commission shall not start before 12:00 noon, unless otherwise noticed on the printed calendar at least 72 hours in advance of a scheduled hearing. The San Francisco Planning Commission does hereby designate Room 400 of City Hall, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, San Francisco, California, as its regular meeting location unless otherwise noticed on the calendar at least 72 hours in advance of a scheduled hearing, or if the need arises because room capacity for Room 400 is anticipated to be exceeded. Provided that where matters of
special concern to certain areas or districts of the city are to be considered, a Meeting place may be designated in the City and County within such areas or districts. The Commission Secretary will present to the Commission on or before the first Regular Meeting day of the year (or subsequent date as stipulated by the Commission) a list for consideration and indication of adoption by voice vote, the Commission's Hearing Schedule for the calendar year, including possible cancellation dates of Regular Meetings to accommodate various holidays throughout the year.

Section 2. Special Meetings. Special Meetings of the Commission shall be open and public and shall be held at such times as the Commission may determine. Special meetings may be called by the President for any time, and must be called by the President upon the written request of three members of the Commission, filed with the Administrative Secretary. The Place of such Meetings shall be as provided above for Regular Meetings.

Section 3. Notice. Notice¹ of the time and place of every Regular Meeting of the Commission shall be given to members of the Commission at least 72 hours before the time of such Meeting, and shall be given by posting and otherwise, as required by San Francisco Administrative Code Section 67.7 and California Government Code Section 54954.2. Notice of the time and place of every Special Meeting of the Commission shall be given to members of the Commission at least 72 hours before the time of such Meetings, and shall be given by posting and otherwise, as required by San Francisco Administrative Code Section 67.6(f) and California Government Code Section 54956. The Commission shall not consider nor act upon any matter at any Regular Meeting except upon (1) written notice thereof as required by this Section 3, or (2) a condition exists that requires emergency action as set forth in San Francisco Administrative Code Section 67.7(e) and California Government Code Section 54954.2(b). No matter shall be considered at any Special Meeting unless included in the Notice calling such meeting.

¹. The San Francisco Administrative Code, Chapter 67 "The San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance of 1999," Section 67.7 stipulates that policy bodies shall post an agenda containing a meaningful description of each item of business to be transacted or discussed at the meeting at least 72 hours before a regular meeting and that it shall post a current agenda on its Internet site at least 72 hours before a regular meeting. Therefore,
the term "notice" shall refer to both written and electronic formats.

Section 4. Cancellation or Change of Regular Meetings. If the Regular Meeting day falls on a legal holiday, or if a recommendation is made by the Director that a Regular Meeting be cancelled or changed, the Commission or the President may cancel the Regular Meeting or fix another time therefor. Notice of cancellation or of a change in a Regular Meeting time must be given at least seventy-two hours before the scheduled time of such Meeting.

Section 5. Quorum. A quorum for the transaction of official business at any Regular or Special Meeting shall consist of a majority of all members of the Commission, but a smaller number may adjourn from time to time and may compel the attendance of absent members in the manner and subject to the penalties, if any, provided by law.

Section 6. Voting.

a. Procedural Matters. Pursuant to Charter Section 4.104, with respect to matters of procedure the Commission may act by the affirmative vote of a majority of the members present, so long as the members present constitute a quorum.
b. Except as provided in "a" above, every Official Act taken by the Commission, including, but not limited to, those based on its jurisdiction derived from the Planning Code, Chapter 31 of the Administrative Code, the Subdivision Code and Discretionary Review Powers of the Commission, may be by "Motion" or "Resolution" adopted by a majority vote of all members of the Commission (four (4) votes). All members present shall vote for or against each question brought to a vote unless a member is excused from voting by a conflict of interest or a motion adopted by a majority of the members present.

A motion that receives less than four votes is a failed motion resulting in disapproval of the action requested to be taken by the Commission unless a substitute motion for a continuance or other action is adopted. (For example: a request for Conditional Use requires four votes to approve; failure to receive the four votes results in denial of the conditional use. A request for Discretionary Review requires four votes to take discretionary review and modify the project; failure to receive four votes results in approval of the proposed project without modification. Planning Code Section 302(c) sets forth the requirements for Commission determinations regarding Planning Code amendments. Planning Code Section 340(d) sets forth the requirements for Commission determinations regarding General Plan amendments.)
A motion of intent occurs when the Commission passes a motion by a majority of all members of the Commission that is contrary to the preliminary recommendation of the Planning Department staff and the Commission does not have findings that support the intended action. Any Commissioner absent from participation in the motion of intent must be provided all relevant case material and hearing tapes for review prior to a scheduled hearing for consideration of the final motion.

c. Once the Commission holds the public hearing on a permit application, receives all public testimony and declares that it is ready to consider approval or disapproval of the application, the applicant shall not be permitted to withdraw the application, except with the consent of the Commission. In the event that the Commission passes any motion of intent to approve or disapprove a permit application before them, the applicant shall not be permitted to withdraw the application prior to the Commission's completion of their action with passage of a written "Motion" with findings or a resolution.

d. Once the Commission holds a public hearing on a matter before them, enters into deliberation and a motion for action is made and receives a second prior to the end of discussion, a request for "call the question" by any member other than the President or Chair would be addressed as follows: The request for "call the question" is considered a motion to halt discussion and must have a second to proceed. If the motion does not receive a second, the motion dies and discussion resumes on the matter on the floor prior to the motion to "call the question." If the motion receives a second then a vote must be taken immediately and passed by a majority of those present.

Section 7. Jurisdiction. Pursuant to Charter Section 4.105, the Commission has the jurisdiction to approve prior to issuance "[all] permits and licenses dependent on, or affected by, the Planning Code administered by the Planning Department." Acting under this section, the Commission may at its discretion by a majority vote of the Commission (four votes), request staff to bring before it for review any such permit or license that has not yet been issued even if the application has been approved by the Commission or Department staff and forwarded to the Central Permit Bureau. The Commission loses jurisdiction upon either the City's issuance of the permit or license, or a valid appeal has been filed to an appellate body.

Section 8. Parliamentary Procedure. The rules of parliamentary practice, as set forth in Robert's Rules of Order, shall govern all meetings of the Commission except as otherwise provided herein.
Section 9. Order of Business. The order of business at any Regular Meeting may be as follows:

1. Roll Call
2. Consent Calendar
3. Commission Matters
4. Action Item List
5. Department Matters
6. Public Comment – 15 Minutes
7. Regular Calendar
8. Discretionary Review Calendar
9. Public Comment
10. Adjournment

The President (or Chair) may change the order of business as determined necessary for the Planning Commission to conduct its business effectively.

Section 10. Public Comment. The item at each Regular Meeting shall provide an opportunity for members of the public to address the Commission on items of interest to the public that are within the subject matter jurisdiction of the Commission, but which are not on the posted agenda for that Meeting. When that item is reached, members of the public may address the Commission for up to three (3) minutes. The President may limit the total testimony by all members of the public to fifteen (15) minutes.

Section 11. Consent Calendar: Items may be placed on a Consent Calendar section of the Meeting Agenda. Items on the Consent Calendar may be approved by a single vote for all items. Any Commissioner, any member of the public or the Director may request that the item be taken off the Consent Calendar and placed on the regular agenda for that Commission Hearing or a later hearing.

Section 12. Submittals: Procedure for submission of material related to any matter that comes before the Commission for their consideration is addressed in Appendix A attached to this document.

Section 13. Hearing Procedures: At either a Regular or Special Meeting, a public hearing
may be held before the Commission on any matter that is on the posted agenda of such Meeting. The procedure for such public hearings is addressed in Appendix A attached to this document.

Section 14. Record. A record shall be kept of each Regular and Special Meeting by the Commission Secretary or by an Acting Secretary designated by the Commission Secretary.

Section 15. Private Transcription. The President may authorize any person to transcribe the proceedings of a Regular or Special Meeting provided that the President may require that a copy of such transcript be provided for the Commission's permanent records.

ARTICLE V – AMENDMENTS

Section 1. These Rules and Regulations may be amended by the Commission at any Regular Meeting by a majority vote following a public hearing, providing that the amendment has been calendared for hearing for at least ten days.

Amended:

August 1, 1957  December 11, 1975  January 21, 1999

January 12, 1961  June 24, 1976  October 19, 2000

October 11, 1961  October 28, 1982  November 18, 2004

March 26, 1964  April 19, 1984  February 10, 2005
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>April 23, 1964</td>
<td>March 19, 1987</td>
<td>August 4, 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 17, 1965</td>
<td>January 20, 1994</td>
<td>August 4, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 1974</td>
<td>September 28, 1995</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 8, 1974</td>
<td>January 25, 1996</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

APPENDIX A OF SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING COMMISSION RULES & REGULATIONS
Submittals and Hearing Procedures:

A. Submittals

Correspondence submitted to the Planning Commission in advance of hearing must be received by the Commission Secretary no later than the close of business the day before a hearing for it to become a part of the public record for any public hearing.

Correspondence submitted to the Planning Commission on the same day, must be submitted at the hearing directly to the Planning Commission Secretary. Correspondence submitted in any other fashion on the same day may not become a part of the public record until the following hearing.

Correspondence sent directly to all members of the Commission, must include a copy to the Commission Secretary (commissions.secretary@sfgov.org) for it to become a part of the public record.

For sponsor and/or opposition briefs to be included in the packet forwarded to the Planning Commission in advance of a hearing, 15 hardcopies and a .pdf copy must be provided to the staff planner no later than the close of business eight days in advance of the hearing. Generally, 5 p.m. Wednesdays.

These submittal rules and deadlines shall be strictly enforced and no exceptions shall be made without a vote of the Commission.

B. Discretionary Review (DR) - Information Packet Form

I. Submittals:

a. Submittals, including staff packets, are due to the Commission one week in advance of hearing.

II. Content of submittals should be as follows:

a. Abbreviated:

   • Staff cover memo attached to DR application and Project Sponsor response;
• Plans in compliance with the Planning Department's "Plan Submittal Guidelines;"
• Color streetscape of both sides of street;
• Digital photographs of existing conditions.

b. Full:

• Same as stated in Abbreviated above; with
• 3-D Renderings.

c. Environmental and historic resource documents to be attached to all submittals.

III. Hearing Procedures:

a. A thorough description of the issue by the Director or a member of the staff.
b. A presentation by the DR Requestor(s) team (includes Requestor(s) or their
designee, lawyers, architects, engineers, expediters, and/or other advisors) would
be for a period not to exceed five (5) minutes for each requestor.
c. Testimony by members of the public in support of the DR would be up to three (3)
minutes each.
d. A presentation by the Project Sponsor(s) team (includes Sponsor(s) or their
designee, lawyers, architects, engineers, expediters, and/or other advisors) would
be for a period up to five (5) minutes, but could be extended for a period not to
exceed 10 minutes if there are multiple DR requestors.
e. Testimony by members of the public in support of the project would be up to
three (3) minutes each.
f. DR requestor(s) or their designees are given two (2) minutes for rebuttal.
g. Project sponsor(s) or their designees are given two (2) minutes for rebuttal.
h. The President (or Acting Chair) may impose time limits on appearances by
members of the public and may otherwise exercise his or her discretion on
procedures for the conduct of public hearings.

IV. Other:

a. Revisions should be submitted to staff and DR requestors by 5pm Tuesday (two
days) before the Thursday Hearing.
b. Revisions submitted at hearing are discouraged and will only be considered at
Commission discretion.

C. Mandatory Discretionary Review (Dwelling Unit Removal)

I. Submittals:
a. Submittals, including staff packets, are due to the Commission one week in advance of hearing.

II. Hearing Procedures:

a. A thorough description of the issue by the Director or a member of the staff
b. A presentation by the Project Sponsor(s) team (includes Sponsor(s) or their designee, lawyers, architects, engineers, expediters, and/or other advisors) would be for a period not to exceed five (5).
c. Testimony by members of the public would be up to three (3) minutes each.
d. The President (or Acting Chair) may impose time limits on appearances by members of the public and may otherwise exercise his or her discretion on procedures for the conduct of public hearings.

D. Cases (Conditional Use (CU); Office Allocation (321); Downtown Project (309); etc.):

I. Submittals:

a. Staff packet due to Commission one week in advance of hearing; or
b. At the discretion of the Planning Director and Planning Commission Officers, two weeks in advance of hearing.

II. Content of submittals should be as follows:

a. Plans in compliance with the Planning Department's "Plan Submittal Guidelines;"
b. Color streetscape of both sides of street;
c. Digital photographs of existing conditions;
d. 3-D digital renderings; and
e. Environmental and historic resource documents to be attached to all submittals.

III. Hearing Procedures:

a. A thorough description of the issue(s) by the Director or a member of the staff.
b. A presentation of the proposal by the Project Sponsor(s) team (includes sponsor or their designee, lawyers, architects, engineers, expediters, and/or other advisors) would be for a period not to exceed 10 minutes, unless a written request for extension not to exceed a total presentation time of 15 minutes is received at least 72 hours in advance of the hearing, through the Commission Secretary, and granted by the President or Chair.
c. A presentation of opposition to the proposal by organized opposition for a period not to exceed 10 minutes (or a period equal to that provided to the project sponsor team) with a minimum of three (3) speakers. The intent of the 10 min block of time provided to organized opposition is to reduce the number of overall speakers who are part of the organized opposition. The requestor should advise the group that the Commission would expect the organized presentation to represent their testimony, if granted. Organized opposition will be recognized only upon written application at least 72 hours in advance of the hearing, through the Commission Secretary, the President or Chair. Such application should identify the organization(s) and speakers.

d. Public testimony from proponents of the proposal: An individual may speak for a period not to exceed three (3) minutes.

e. Public testimony from opponents of the proposal: An individual may speak for a period not to exceed three (3) minutes.

f. Director's preliminary recommendation must be prepared in writing.

g. Action by the Commission on the matter before it.

h. In public hearings on Draft Environmental Impact Reports, all speakers will be limited to a period not to exceed three (3) minutes.

i. The President (or Acting Chair) may impose time limits on appearances by members of the public and may otherwise exercise his or her discretion on procedures for the conduct of public hearings.

IV. Other:

a. Revisions should be submitted to staff by 5pm Tuesday (two days) before the Thursday Hearing.

b. Revisions submitted at hearing are discouraged and will only be considered at Commission discretion.

E. Policy or Major Project Informational Presentations

I. Submittals:

a. Staff packet due to Commission one week in advance of hearing; or

b. At the discretion of the Planning Director and Planning Commission Officers, two weeks in advance of hearing.

II. Hearing Procedures:

a. An introduction of the item or issue by the Director or a member of the staff.

b. A presentation of the item or issue by staff or the issuing agency for a period not to
exceed 20 minutes.
c. The President (or Acting Chair) may impose time limits on appearances by members of the public and may otherwise exercise his or her discretion on procedures for the conduct of public hearings.

III. Other:

a. Revisions should be submitted to staff by 5pm Tuesday (two days) before the Thursday Hearing.
b. Revisions submitted at hearing are discouraged and will only be considered at Commission discretion.

F. CEQA Appeals of Negative Declarations

I. Submittals:

a. Staff packet due to Commission one week in advance of hearing; or
b. At the discretion of the Planning Director and Planning Commission Officers, two weeks in advance of hearing.

II. Hearing Procedures:

a. A thorough description of the issue by the Director or a member of the staff
b. A presentation by the Appellant(s) team (includes appellant or their designee, lawyers, architects, engineers, expediters, and/or other advisors) would be for a period not to exceed ten (10) minutes.
c. A presentation by the Project Sponsor(s) team (includes sponsor or their designee, lawyers, architects, engineers, expediters, and/or other advisors) would be for a period not to exceed ten (10) minutes.
d. Testimony by members of the public would be up to three (3) minutes each.
e. The President (or Acting Chair) may impose time limits on appearances by members of the public and may otherwise exercise his or her discretion on procedures for the conduct of public hearings.

G. Amendment to motions should be read back at the same hearing before the vote is taken.

NOTE

The Commission strongly discourages members of the public, project sponsors,
architects, lawyers, etc. to cross the railing that separates the Commission and staff from the public seating area to engage in conversation with staff or the members of the Commission while a meeting is in session.

AMENDED: July 2, 2015
President Melgar and Commissioners:

Thank you for being open and proactive to considering staff input in the Director of Planning hiring process. You’ve attended our staff meeting, been available for one-on-one conversations, and supported this survey effort, and we thank you for that.

We appreciate the major responsibility it is to provide the Mayor with qualified candidates for the next Director. That person will work with you, 200+ dedicated public servants in the department, elected officials, and the diverse San Francisco community to implement the City’s vision. With such major responsibilities, we realize there are many factors that go into the Commission’s decision process. We hope the attached staff survey results inform your hiring process and look forward to the continued conversation. Please let us know if you have any questions on the results.

Sincerely,

Tam Tran, Senior Planner, Citywide Planning  
Wade Wietgrefe, Principal Planner, Environmental Planning

Jonas P. Ionin,  
Director of Commission Affairs

Planning Department| City & County of San Francisco  
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, CA 94103  
Direct: 415-558-6309 | Fax: 415-558-6409

jonas.ionin@sfgov.org  
www.sfplanning.org
Dear Supervisor Brown,

My name is B Freas. I work or at CommunityGrows in District 5. I am in support of your legislation to allow a formula retail grocery store to be conditionally permitted within the Fulton Street Grocery Store Special Use District (SUD), per the support of Mo Magic and members of the community who have lived there long before I was born.

Currently, Trader Joe’s is interested in moving into 555 Fulton Street; I support this new grocery retail option, as our neighborhood has lacked a healthy, full-service, and affordable grocery store for decades. Not only will Trader Joe’s provide affordable and fresh options, but they are committed to hiring and training workers locally and directly from this community. I encourage you to pass this legislation to bring a healthier and accessible grocery option to our neighborhood.

Thank you,
B Freas
BEET Educator
CommunityGrows
Planting seeds... empowering youth
Website / Facebook / Instagram
Phone: 415-795-3855
Pronouns: They/Them
Jonas P. Ionin,
Director of Commission Affairs

Planning Department| City & County of San Francisco
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, CA 94103
Direct: 415-558-6309| Fax: 415-558-6409

jonas.ionin@sfgov.org
www.sfplanning.org

-----Original Message-----
From: Thomas Schuttish <schuttishtr@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Friday, October 18, 2019 4:13 PM
To: Melgar, Myrna (CPC) <myrna.melgar@sfgov.org>; Koppel, Joel (CPC) <joel.koppel@sfgov.org>; mooreurban@aol.com; Fung, Frank (CPC) <frank.fung@sfgov.org>; Johnson, Milicent (CPC) <milicent.johnson@sfgov.org>; Richards, Dennis (CPC) <dennis.richards@sfgov.org>
Cc: CPC-Commissions Secretary <commissions.secretary@sfgov.org>; Cisneros, Stephanie (CPC) <stephanie.cisneros@sfgov.org>
Subject: October 24th Commission Hearing Item No.19

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear President Melgar, Vice President Koppel and Commissioners Moore, Fung, Johnson and Richards,

Attached are the comments I submitted on September 16, 2019 which are referenced in the Staff Report for this project to be heard at your October 24th hearing.

Thank you and take care.

Sincerely,
Georgia
Attached are your Calendars for October 24, 2019.

Please be reminded that we are down to six Commissioners. Com. Pres. Melgar is expected to be absent this week and Com. Johnson is expected to leave early. If for any reason any additional Commissioner is absent we will lose our quorum.

Enjoy the weekend,

Jonas P. Ionin,
Director of Commission Affairs

Planning Department
City & County of San Francisco
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, CA 94103
Direct: 415-558-6309|Fax: 415-558-6409

jonas.ionin@sfgov.org
www.sfplanning.org
Commissioners,

Attached is the Department’s response to the Appeal of the PMND. Please advise if you would like to have a hardcopy mailed to you.

Jonas P. Ionin,
Director of Commission Affairs

Planning Department\City & County of San Francisco
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, CA 94103
Direct: 415-558-6309|Fax: 415-558-6409

jonas.ionin@sfgov.org
www.sfplanning.org
Dear Supervisor Brown,

My name is Lyslynn Lacoste. I live in Hayes Valley in District 5 and I'm a loyal Trader Joe's customer. Currently, I have to travel to the SOMA, downtown SF or Nob Hill to access the great and affordable quality products from Trader Joe's. I am in support of your legislation to allow a formula retail grocery store to be conditionally permitted within the Fulton Street Grocery Store Special Use District (SUD). Currently, Trader Joe’s is interested in moving into 555 Fulton Street; I support this new grocery retail option, as our neighborhood has lacked a healthy, full-service, and affordable grocery store for decades. Not only will Trader Joe’s provide affordable and fresh options, but they are committed to hiring and training workers locally and directly from this community. I encourage you to pass this legislation to bring a healthier and accessible grocery option to our neighborhood.

Thank you for moving this legislation forward!
Dear Supervisor Brown,

My name is Ana Canillas. My partner and I live in District 5 and are active voters who have invested our lives here since buying a home in the Western Addition in the 1990’s. One of the attractions back then was the richly diverse community and affordability. I had the honor of working with activists and leaders like Patricia Walkup, who inspired and believed in this vision of community.

One of the items battled for was Formula retail legislation - hard fought.

But, in this case, having affordable grocery store with fresh produce to the Western Addition is worthwhile.

I, and many of my neighbors who are aging and with mobility challenges too, are in support of your legislation to allow a formula retail grocery store to be conditionally permitted within the Fulton Street Grocery Store Special Use District (SUD).

I understand this formula retail grocery store would be conditionally permitted within the Fulton Street Grocery Store SUD. The exemption only applies to the potential grocery store. If this legislation passes, the retailer will still have to go through a conditional use authorization process,
which will include time to discuss and address community concerns.

I understand, currently, Trader Joe’s is interested in moving into 555 Fulton Street; I and many of my neighbors support this new grocery retail option, as our neighborhood has lacked a healthy, full-service, and affordable grocery store for decades. Not only will Trader Joe’s provide affordable and fresh options, but they are committed to hiring and training workers locally and directly from this community. I encourage you to pass this legislation to bring a healthier and accessible grocery option to our neighborhood.

Thank you for your leadership and time!
Ana Canillas
District 5 Resident and active voter since 1998
Email a.canillas@yahoo.com

Sent from my iPhone.
Jonas P. Ionin,
Director of Commission Affairs
Planning Department
City & County of San Francisco
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, CA 94103
Direct: 415-558-6309/Fax: 415-558-6409
jonas.ionin@sfgov.org
www.sfplanning.org

-----Original Message-----
From: Jason M Henderson <Jhenders@sonic.net>
Sent: Thursday, October 17, 2019 1:30 PM
To: Melgar, Myrna (CPC) <myrna.melgar@sfgov.org>
Cc: Flores, Veronica (CPC) <Veronica.Flores@sfgov.org>; Brown, Vallie (BOS) <vallie.brown@sfgov.org>; Simley, Shakirah (BOS) <shakirah.simley@sfgov.org>; Koppel, Joel (CPC) <joel.koppel@sfgov.org>; Dennis Richards <drichts20@gmail.com>; Richards, Dennis (CPC) <dennis.richards@sfgov.org>; CPC-Commissions Secretary <commissions.secretary@sfgov.org>; kathrin Moore <mooreurban@aol.com>; Fung, Frank (CPC) <frank.fung@sfgov.org>
Subject: Re: Trader Joe's Proposal @ 555 Fulton - Oct 17 Item 10

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear President Melgar and fellow Commissioners

I mistakenly sent you a letter today that had the wrong address heading.
This is the correct version. Sorry for the confusion.

-jh

On 10/17/2019 09:27, Jason M Henderson wrote:
> Dear President Melgar and fellow Planning Commissioners
> > Please find attached a letter from HVNA's Transportation and Planning Committee regarding the proposed Trader Joe's at 555 Fulton. Thank you
> > > -jh
> > --
> Jason Henderson
> San Francisco CA
> 94102
Jonas P. Ionin,
Director of Commission Affairs

Planning Department\City & County of San Francisco
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, CA 94103
Direct: 415-558-6309/Fax: 415-558-6409

jonas.ionin@sfgov.org
www.sfplanning.org

-----Original Message-----
From: Brown, Vallie (BOS) <vallie.brown@sfgov.org>
Sent: Thursday, October 17, 2019 1:50 PM
To: Ana Canillas <a.canillas@yahoo.com>
Cc: Simley, Shakirah (BOS) <shakirah.simley@sfgov.org>; BrownStaff <brownstaff@sfgov.org>; Krywenko, Caleb (BOS) <caleb.krywenko@sfgov.org>; Koppel, Joel (CPC) <joel.koppel@sfgov.org>; CPC-Commissions Secretary <commissions.secretary@sfgov.org>
Subject: Re: Support for Trader Joes Grocery Store at 555 Fulton Street

Hi Ana, thank you for reaching out and your support.

Best,
Vallie

Sent from my iPhone

> On Oct 17, 2019, at 1:31 PM, Ana Canillas <a.canillas@yahoo.com> wrote:
>
I am a resident of Glen Park, and I would like to express to the Planning Commission that I support Supervisor Mandelman’s proposal to limit parking expansion.

Additionally, I want to specifically reject the idea that Glen Park’s largest developable parcel, steps from our BART station, ought to remain a parking lot. This special dispensation should be revoked. The neighborhood does not need a parking lot here, as demonstrated earlier this year when the site was closed for construction. What we need is transit-oriented housing. (And maybe a nice sidewalk cafe.)

Thank you,
Anne Wintroub
Jonas P. Ionin,
Director of Commission Affairs

Planning Department| City & County of San Francisco
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, CA 94103
Direct: 415-558-6309| Fax: 415-558-6409

jonas.ionin@sfgov.org
www.sfplanning.org

-----Original Message-----
From: Martha Knutzen <kipnisknut@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, October 17, 2019 4:15 PM
To: Brown, Vallie (BOS) <vallie.brown@sfgov.org>
Cc: Simley, Shakirah (BOS) <shakirah.simley@sfgov.org>; Krywenko, Caleb (BOS)
<caleb.krywenko@sfgov.org>; Melgar, Myrna (CPC) <myrna.melgar@sfgov.org>; Koppel, Joel (CPC)
<joe.koppel@sfgov.org>; CPC-Commissions Secretary <commissions.secretary@sfgov.org>
Subject: Support for waiver for Trader Joe's at 555 Fulton

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.
Dear Supervisor Brown,

My name is Rae Dinh. You visited me at my residence at 739 Webster St. in District 5 and told me about the plan to lift the retail ban to allow Trader Joe’s to move into 555 Fulton, which is one block from my house. I am in support of your legislation to allow a formula retail grocery store to be conditionally permitted within the Fulton Street Grocery Store Special Use District (SUD).

Currently, Trader Joe’s is interested in moving into 555 Fulton Street; I support this new grocery retail option, as our neighborhood has lacked a healthy, full-service, and affordable grocery store for decades. Not only will Trader Joe’s provide affordable and fresh options, but they are committed to hiring and training workers locally and directly from this community. I encourage you to pass this legislation to bring a healthier and accessible grocery option to our neighborhood.

Thank you,
Rae
Dear Commissioners,

It's become obvious that Discretionary Review on 463 Castro Street is occurring simply because the owners of Gyro XPress wants the city to protect it from competitors. One would have hoped the Planning Commission and its staff are competent enough to recognize these types of invalid appeals but that's appearing not to be the case. Please take a stand against regulatory capture and unfairly hindering small businesses by reconsidering this review.

Thank you,
Dan Baron
There were no Board hearings this week, but this report covers what happened last week.

Thanks,

Aaron Starr, MA
Manager of Legislative Affairs
Planning Department, City and County of San Francisco
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, CA 94103
Direct: 415-558-6362 Fax: 415-558-6409
Email: aaron.starr@sfgov.org
Web: www.sfplanning.org