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From: Soledad McCarthy <solmc87@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, June 04, 2020 10:17 AM
To: Koppel, Joel (CPC) <joel.koppel@sfgov.org>; Moore, Kathrin (CPC) <kathrin.moore@sfgov.org>; Diamond, Susan (CPC) <sue.diamond@sfgov.org>; Johnson, Milicent (CPC) <milicent.johnson@sfgov.org>; Ionin, Jonas (CPC) <jonas.ionin@sfgov.org>; CPC-Commissions Secretary <commissions.secretary@sfgov.org>; Fung, Frank (CPC) <frank.fung@sfgov.org>; Imperial, Theresa (CPC) <theresa.imperial@sfgov.org>
Cc: Mar, Gordon (BOS) <gordon.mar@sfgov.org>
Subject: Lights at Saint Ignatius Field

Planning Commissioners:

Joel Koppel,- President –
Kathrin Moore, Sue Diamond, Frank S. Fung, Theresa Imperial,
Milicent A. Johnson,
Clerk, Jonas Ionin

Cc: Supervisor Gordon Mar-District 4

June 2, 2020
President Joel Koppel  
and Honorable Commissioners  
San Francisco Planning Commission  
San Francisco City Hall

**VIA EMAIL**

Re: Lights at St. Ignatius Field

Dear Commissioners:

My name is Soledad McCarthy. I am a third generation San Franciscan, an alumna of Saint Ignatius College Preparatory. I live in the Sunset District. I am married to an alumnus of Saint Ignatius. We plan to send our daughter to Saint Ignatius. I am a Professor of Business at Skyline College and education is very important to our family. The lights will not only provide a way to keep our children safe and playing sports, it will also provide lighting to keep the neighborhood safe. We need to put our children first by providing safe outlets for them to congregate. We would be helping to facilitate exercise and health. Our students would be under the care of adults who can provide guidance instead of parties and drinking. If we had the ability for night games while I was in high school, I can’t help but think we would have been safer and been able to make better decisions with our free time.

I’m writing in strong support for approval of lights at St. Ignatius Field in order to create more options for student athletes and also to allow St. Ignatius to implement a later start time in accordance to CA State law.

There are fewer spaces for students to practice field sports in San Francisco and allowing S.I. to build these lights will keep students closer to the campus rather than traveling great distances to practice.

St. Ignatius College Preparatory has been an excellent center of learning not just to take tests and get good grades but to be in service to others. Many of those lessons are learned through the shared experience on the field. Even the students who participate as spectators gain a strong feeling of community by supporting their friends and fellow classmates.

Please vote YES! to the lights at St. Ignatius Field and thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Soledad McCarthy
3716 Taraval Street, San Francisco, CA 94116
solmc87@gmail.com
Here's how it will work. A stranger will drive to our block, park up the hill (most of this block is up the hill) walk down to 667 Mississippi St, ingest some quantity of a mind-altering substance (the folks at the shop have pinky-promised that this won't be a problem), walk back to their car, back out blindly into the traffic lane (because that's how it's done on this block) and drive home feeling good and looking forward to the next visit. It will work this way again and again because there is nothing to stop it and whatever can happen, will happen.

667 Mississippi St constitutes the MUR on the east side of Mississippi St between 20th and 22nd Sts. It is the only non-residential structure on the east side of this block and has been for years. It has operated as a non-storefront cannabis production facility for some time now without any problems with the neighborhood. To change this to a retail operation with on-site consumption would increase dramatically the volume and kind of foot and vehicular traffic there and the burden of much of this change will fall on us. It actually already has in terms of
the recent increase in traffic of large trucks that not only load or unload at 667 Mississippi St but then leave there and find parking in front of homes all over the neighborhood, as far away as Daniel Webster School, moving every couple of hours to avoid getting a ticket.

I have resided at 637 Mississippi St for 43 years and I am writing to strongly protest the granting of the above change in the business at 667 Mississippi St. This will be, for all intents and purposes, a bar, with pot instead liquor, and this is the wrong place for a bar.

Donald J Henry, with the endorsement of Carol L Dondrea, Samuel LD Henry, Megan Bourne -- all registered voters at this address
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From: Gina Ramirez <gina0848@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, June 04, 2020 10:57 AM
To: Koppel, Joel (CPC) <joel.koppel@sfgov.org>; Moore, Kathrin (CPC) <kathrin.moore@sfgov.org>; Diamond, Susan (CPC) <sue.diamond@sfgov.org>; Fung, Frank (CPC) <frank.fung@sfgov.org>; Imperial, Theresa (CPC) <theresa.imperial@sfgov.org>; Johnson, Milicent (CPC) <milicent.johnson@sfgov.org>; Ionin, Jonas (CPC) <jonas.ionin@sfgov.org>; CPC-Commissions Secretary <commissions.secretary@sfgov.org>
Cc: Mar, Gordon (BOS) <gordon.mar@sfgov.org>
Subject: Re: Lights at St. Ignatius Field
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June 3, 2020

President Joel Koppel
and Honorable Commissioners
San Francisco Planning Commission
San Francisco City Hall

Dear Commissioners:
My name is Georgina R Ramirez, I live in the Sunset District in San Francisco. My son, George Ramirez, attends St. Ignatius, he will be a Sophomore and plays Football. As a parent I’m extremely in favor of getting the field lights in support of students athletes and their right to have a well equipped campus to practice and play in all seasons of the year.

I’m writing in strong support for approval of lights at St. Ignatius Field in order to create more options for student athletes and also to allow St. Ignatius to implement a later start time in accordance to CA State law.

There are fewer spaces for students to practice field sports in San Francisco and allowing S.I. to build these lights will keep students closer to the campus rather than traveling great distances to practice.

St. Ignatius College Preparatory has been an excellent center of learning not just to take tests and get good grades but to be in service to others. Many of those lessons are learned through the shared experience on the field. Even the students who participate as spectators gain a strong feeling of community by supporting their friends and fellow classmates.

Please vote YES! to the lights at St. Ignatius Field and thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

NAME
ADDRESS
EMAIL
June 4, 2020 San Francisco Planning Commission Meeting

To the Members of the San Francisco Planning Commission:

I write this letter in support of the UCSF Comprehensive Parnassus Heights Plan presented today before the Commission. For more than two years, UCSF has engaged with the communities surrounding the UCSF Parnassus Campus in an open and transparent process. UCSF has included many of the communities ideas into the comprehensive plan. The University’s mission and priorities retain the final decision-making power in the design, however, the plan today reflects many of the innovations and amenities proposed during the engagement process and that are important to the neighborhoods surrounding UCSF.

I would ask that the Commission today consider particularly the development of campus housing in the comprehensive plan as well as long-term transportation mitigation plans for the
project. Both of these issues are priority issues for the Inner Sunset neighborhood and the surrounding communities and directly impact the vibrancy of the Inner Sunset neighborhood as well as the quality of life issues.

As a longtime member of the UCSF faculty and a proud resident of the Inner Sunset Community adjacent to campus, I am proud of the pivotal role UCSF has played in the vibrancy of the Inner Sunset neighborhood for many years and fully believe that the final Comprehensive Parnassus Heights Plan will serve in maintaining UCSF as a world class institution and continue to foster a transparent and vibrant relationship with the Inner Sunset community.

Sincerely,
Karen G. Duderstadt PhD, RN, CPNP, FAAN
UCSF Clinical Professor Emerita

Inner Sunset Resident
1327 10th Ave.
Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors, Planning Commission and Mayor Breed,

Scott Wiener’s ill-conceived and hastily passed ADU is legislation with unintended racial consequences.

Overwhelmingly the beneficiaries of this legislation are rich white real estate developers who have been given an irresponsible opportunity to ravage our city and its residents for profit. Consequently it is the disadvantaged renters of our city who are suffering damages as the ADU degrades their quality of life.

Look at the situation in our building at 801 Corbett. Those of us who can afford to live here (with rent control and on fixed/low income) are primarily on the first floor above the garage because these are the most affordable units. Consequently the majority of racial and economic diversity exists on this first level: African-American, Hispanic, Indian, and the elderly. It is this group that will suffer the greatest damages should an ADU be allowed at 801 Corbett.

Racial injustice is being addressed today nationwide, it is completely unacceptable that an African-American family will get hurt the most if an ADU is allowed to proceed here. My friend Lorenzo and his wife live in a unit directly above where the ADU construction is proposed.
If an ADU is allowed to proceed they will lose their parking place making it much more difficult to get to their jobs. The construction noise (which will be unbearable directly below them) going on for two years or more will make it impossible for them to relax while off work. Jackhammers, nail guns and heavy machinery working directly underneath their floor will shake their unit like an earthquake every day and fill it with acrid dust and toxic fumes. With nerves rattled and in a constant state of fatigue from all the construction combined with the burden of a more difficult commute, this disruption could inevitably lead to their losing their jobs and their housing here.

It is no wonder why our nation is so angry. How does a black man feel when a rich white man living far away in another city takes away his parking and subjects him to years of noise, dust and toxic fumes? It is awful what African-Americans sometimes have to deal with when they step out of their homes, but it is truly unforgivable that Our City has allowed this ADU legislation to open the door for harm in the place where families come home after work to seek peace and quiet.

Eliminating racial inequality starts by taking definitive action so that the life of this African-American family (and all the minorities here) is not harmed so that an obscenely rich Orange County developer can get even richer.

Mark E. Hyatt (a wealthy Newport Beach developer, aka: MEH Pioneer, LLC) bought our building on 10/3/2018 with the sole intention of cramming it with ADU’s and flipping it for profit. We all lived in peace here until he became our landlord and made our lives a living hell. Now he’s getting ready to file for an ADU that will cause great harm, it must not be allowed to proceed.

I have received a San Francisco buildingeye alert to the following:

801 CORBETT AVE, SAN FRANCISCO, CA
Application Number: 2020-004981GEN
Received Date: May 13, 2020
Description: 801 CORBETT AVE - Historic Resource Assessment (HRA)  Applicant: Joe Peters, MEH Pioneer, LLC, 230 Newport Center Dr., Newport Beach 92660
Contact Information: Marcelle Boudreaux (415) 575-9140 marcelle.boudreaux@sfgov.org
Status: Accepted

Joe Peters, doing the bidding of his standoffish boss Mark E. Hyatt (aka: MEH Pioneer, LLC) is now trying to knock down the Planning Commission obstacles he is facing in trying to destroy the architectural harmony that is embodied in 801 Corbett. If he gets past this first evaluation (which he should never be allowed to do) then he’ll file for an ADU.

For over a year I have been pleading with all of you to do something about the abuse of the ADU. I was one of the first whistle-blowers (over a year ago) to bring ADU abuse to the attention of the Supervisors and later the Planning Commission at a hearing on 3/14/19.

The Board of Supervisors needs to implement immediate measures reforming this defective legislation, and concurrently give the Planning Commission the authority to reject ADU applications that negatively impact renters like the African-American tenants here.
Three actions should immediately be implemented to restore San Francisco to a peaceful, respectful place for renters to live.

1. Give the Planning Commission the necessary and immediate authority that they can consider the well-being of tenants as the most important factor in approving or disapproving ADU projects here in the city.

2. Add protections to the ADU for current residents of rent controlled buildings:
   - No amenities relied upon by existing residents shall be infringed for the purpose of adding additional units to include: access, parking, laundry and storage. Additional units shall be properly insulated for sound to minimize disturbing adjacent units. Construction of additional units shall respect the current residents and not disrupt their access, parking or other amenities. Residents shall be protected from the noise, vibration and dust of demolition & construction. Construction shall be completed within a reasonable length of time.

3. Put a stop to greedy Landlord's abuse of renters by instituting a $250,000 fine for any landlord caught harassing tenants, not responding to their needs in a timely manner or otherwise negatively affecting the quality of their life at their residence. We need to change their attitude from one of arrogance to one of walking on eggshells in consideration of their tenant's well being.

A law like #3 would change the landscape to one of landlords who truly care about their tenants. All three actions would give thousands peace of mind and tranquility at home here in The City.

Because of my efforts to prevent the disruption of lives at our building, I have faced constant retaliation by new owner/speculator Mark E. Hyatt (aka: MEH Pioneer, LLC) and Joe Peters his ADU developer.

Wealthy Newport Beach Mark E. Hyatt is extremely secretive and there are no images of him anywhere. However, his wife "Honeybee" (yes, her real name) loves flaunting their wealth (and CO2 emissions) for the news in Republican-rich Orange County. Mr. Hyatt has never returned any of the dozens of calls made and emails I have sent him regarding building problems and harassment by his developer Joe Peters.

Because of my outspoken opposition to the ADU plans that they have here, I have been the victim of an ever increasing amount of harassment by Joe Peters, the developer hired by Mark Hyatt. Joe Peters recently moved here from NY and has made it his full time activity to exploit the ADU law for the quick enrichment of out-of-town speculators. Developer Joe Peters is the worst human being I've ever encountered in my entire life. I have been the victim of an ongoing campaign of abuse that has left me (a senior citizen with disabilities) terrified at times and a nervous wreck.

- He has followed me with a camera taking pictures of me and then sends me printouts letting me know he is "watching" me.
- He has come to the building late at night knocking on my door, waking me up and taunting me. I have had to call the police to escort him off the property.
- In collusion with the owner Mark Hyatt they have conspired to isolate me by not responding to my requests/concerns. When I confronted him about this he just looked at me with a sickly smile and acknowledged that no one is going to talk or respond to me. My requests go unanswered and the building continues to deteriorate.
Despite my emotional pleading with him, he deliberately removed the security system protecting our cars in the garage. It had been keeping us safe for years preventing burglaries and even helping the police catch gang suspects that were doing crime all over the city. As soon as he tore it down we had a rash of burglaries in the garage and no more protection for our vehicles. This was intentionally inflicting emotional distress upon myself and the other tenants.

He has repeatedly threatened me with eviction in an arrogant and abusive manner. He takes every opportunity to remind me of the eviction power he has because of his employment by the owner.

I believe these people have but one priority: to stuff the building's garage with an extra unit or two and then flip it for what they hope will be a big profit. I don't think they care at all about the housing situation here in Our City because I've never seen the building with so many vacant units since they took over. That is the problem that the ADU has created and it must be addressed and these developers must be stopped before their actions further erode the quality of life for this African-American family as well as negatively affecting the 30 other tenants who live here. Additionally, there is a new concern for seniors living here since the outbreak of COVID-19.

Many of us seniors here now rely more than ever on our automobiles for essential needs like visiting our doctors, physical therapists and getting medications/groceries. In this tragic new era of COVID-19, public transit and taxis are no longer an option for those of us who are so vulnerable to getting infected. The only safe way for us to get around is in our cars. Joe Peters intended ADU will destroy the garage, eliminate our parking and seriously degrade our quality of life, putting us all at risk.

In addition to taking away access and parking for our cars, an ADU construction here will bring in dozens of workers on a daily basis for at least two years or more, some of whom may unknowingly spread the virus. The heavy breathing from hard physical exertion and inevitable yelling instructions etc. will fill the air with infected particles more than any other activity in this neighborhood. This would turn into a death sentence for us seniors here, the same way it has been when infected individuals have entered retirement and nursing homes. It will be impossible for us to avoid them and regardless of how many precautions we take, air from the garage comes up freely into units like mine directly above the garage, there will eventually be a tragedy.

Since developer Mark E. Hyatt (aka MEH Pioneer, LLC) bought our building to ADU it for a quick profit, we have had issues with the smoke alarms and leaking water around the fire sprinkler system. We live in constant fear that our building will burn like his Woodside building did (see below). This is especially concerning since some of the children at Rooftop School across the street use our garage to wait for their parents to pick them up. Mark Hyatt should not be allowed to own property here in San Francisco.

Newport Beach based Mark E. Hyatt (aka MEH Pioneer, LLC) has a bad history of building ownership and fire, just reference this newspaper article (also note his use of many corporate aliases: MEH Pioneer LLC, KDF Hallmark LP, KDF Communities LLC, etc.):

The San Mateo County Times - 2013

The six-alarm fire in the 72-unit Hallmark House Apartments at 531 Woodside Road displaced 97 residents and killed one tenant — 48-year-old Darin Michael Demello-Pine. About 20 people, including three firefighters, were injured as a result of the fire, first reported around 2 a.m. on July 7. A lawsuit, filed in San Mateo County Superior Court on behalf of Jorge and Juana Chavez, states that Hallmark House residents “suffered displacement, fear, emotional trauma, and the loss of most of their life’s possessions” because of the fire. The building’s owner, KDF Hallmark L.P., is to blame for the way the fire spread, according to the lawsuit, because it failed to “properly inspect, maintain and safeguard the property from a foreseeable unit fire.” KDF founder Mark Hyatt said in a phone interview that he can’t comment on the pending legal action.

We now live in fear because of Mark E. Hyatt's (aka MEH Pioneer, LLC) troubled history with his Woodside building burning and causing death. Mr. Hyatt has never returned any of the dozens of calls made and emails I have sent to him regarding harassment by his developer Joe Peters, neglected building maintenance issues, or flooding emergencies. Not even a response regarding a large dripping water damage hole in the fire sprinkler section of our garage ceiling that wasn't repaired for 10 months.
This person Mark E. Hyatt (aka MEH Pioneer, LLC) cannot be trusted with the well-being of tenants here in San Francisco. If he can’t properly manage this building or the one in Woodside, then it is highly likely that his ADU plans for our garage will become a disaster. His history speaks for itself.

When he submits his ADU planning application to the Planning Commission IT MUST BE REJECTED for the well-being of all of us that call San Francisco home.

Please do not allow the life of this African-American family here to be ruined for the benefit of a wealthy Newport Beach developer. I pray that all of you will do the right thing.

Please help me stop this.

Sincerely,

Roger Dawson
801 Corbett, # 15
San Francisco, CA 94131

Cell: (650) 218-5431
Dear Planning Commissioners,

Attached is a letter summarizing my reasons for supporting UCSF’s Parnassus campus plans. I have a conflict this afternoon which prevents my participating in the Planning Commission public comment process.

Thank you.

Jeanne Myerson
Advisory Committee member, neighborhood resident (since 1989)
100 Belgrave Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94117

Jeanne Myerson
jrmyerson@icloud.com or jrmyerson@yahoo.com
Dear David Weissglass and SF Planning Commission Secretary and Members,

This has been part of other emails but we think it really needs to have focus on its own.

At the beginning of April, the developers entered into an agreement with us that if we stopped our opposition to what they wanted to do on the 2nd and 3rd floors, and relayed the dropping of our opposition to the Planning Dept, that they would drop their 4th floor proposal. We and our neighbors fulfilled our part of that agreement and stopped our opposition. A month later, after the Planning Dept subsequently dropped their opposition to the lower floor issues, the developers broke their agreement with us and proceeded with their 4th floor proposal. They got what they wanted from us in the agreement and then reneged on what they had committed to do in exchange.

Also, I just noticed that this is not accurate in the Planning Dept staff report "In early April, the Sponsor informed neighbors and City staff that the fourth-floor scope of work in this permit was likely no longer going to be pursued." They told us that it would not be pursued - which is quite different. This was their compromise/agreement with us for
dropping our opposition to their lower floor plans. They were the ones who proposed this agreement. And we fulfilled our part of the agreement.

There are 89 letters of opposition from immediate neighbors with over 100 signatures. So far as we know the developer's proposal has no support from any neighbors. I'd also note that the previous owners were Delancey Street, who used this building as a halfway house, and we neighbors never complained or tried to block this usage. Also, the developers have already got approval to replace 20 bedrooms with 40 bedrooms and to eliminate all parking. It is very greedy to now also be pushing for four multi-level luxury penthouses that would "pop up "onto a 4th floor to the great detriment of the neighborhood.

Best regards,

Larry

Larry Delaney
1279 44th Ave
To the Members of the San Francisco Planning Commission:

I write this letter in support of the UCSF Comprehensive Parnassus Heights Plan. Over the last two years, UCSF has engaged in an open and transparent process with me and my neighbors regarding the plan. The plan was developed with the input from myself and neighbors like me and is reflective of both the University’s mission and priorities and the community interests and benefits for my community.

UCSF asked me, a community leader, to help find Inner Sunset neighbors to be part of the group. It is hard to get young parents with children involved--they are busy but they also represent the next generation of neighbors. UCSF wanted to hear from them, not just the same voices that served on the ongoing Community Advisory Group (CAG) UCSF spent many hours of meeting asking for input on many topics. They listened to all ideas and I believe they are balancing the items that neighbors want with the reality of building a world class hospital and school. I am proud to be part of the process and hope to still be around to see the fruits of our labor in thirty years!
Sincerely,
Martha Ehrenfeld
1379 6th Ave
USCF Community Advisory Group
Inner Sunset Park Neighbors President (for identification purposes only, this is NOT an endorsement by the ISPN board)
Commission Affairs
San Francisco Planning Department
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400 San Francisco, CA 94103
Direct: 415.575.9111 | www.sfplanning.org
San Francisco Property Information Map

REduced CAPACITY DURING THE SHELTER IN PLACE ORDER -- The Planning Department is open for business. Most of our staff are working from home and we're available by e-mail. Our Public Portal, where you can file new applications, and our award-winning Property Information Map are available 24/7. Similarly, the Board of Appeals and Board of Supervisors are accepting appeals via e-mail despite office closures. To protect everyone’s health, all of our in-person services at 1650 and 1660 Mission Street are suspended, and the Planning and Historic Preservation Commissions are cancelled until April 9, at the earliest. Click here for more information.

From: ChristinaR Quiroz <quirozc@sfusd.edu>
Sent: Thursday, June 04, 2020 7:32 AM
To: CPC-Commissions Secretary <commissions.secretary@sfgov.org>
Cc: Diamond, Susan (CPC) <sue.diamond@sfgov.org>; Johnson, Milicent (CPC) <milicent.johnson@sfgov.org>; Fung, Frank (CPC) <frank.fung@sfgov.org>; Koppel, Joel (CPC) <joel.koppel@sfgov.org>; Imperial, Theresa (CPC) <theresa.imperial@sfgov.org>; Moore, Kathrin (CPC) <kathrin.moore@sfgov.org>; delandsf@gmail.com
Subject: Planning Commission DR Review 6/4 1 p.m. Re: 667 Mississippi Street

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

Please accept this statement in regards to discussion for 667 Mississippi Street DR

Sent from my iPad
Commissioners, I urge you to delve deeply into the numerous issues with the grand plan proposed by UCSF. Yes, there are potential benefits.

I am a long-time neighbor of the Parnassus campus, a member of the on-going Community Advisory Group, and have been a member of a number of temporary Advisory Committees.

UCSF is a beloved San Francisco institution, graduating many top medical professionals, serving thousands of patients and operating at least four hospitals. Yet like many large institutions, USCF can sometimes overwhelm immediate neighboring communities and can have significant negative impacts on San Francisco.

Take the example of Dogpatch. Despite written agreements for specific actions and with specified dollar amounts, these agreements haven’t been fully carried out in the years since agreed. Notably they include the Esprit Park and the Community Center.

If you read the letter that the Chancellor sent to the Mayor, Board President Yee and Supervisor Preston, you'll see that "no further public input is needed--we've got it covered--trust us." The Advisory Committee meetings have been like punching a ticket. Every suggestion is written down, then largely put aside. UCSF has shown no intention of taking steps to mitigate the impacts it plans.
And really, do we need to shoehorn a 900,000 gross square foot, 300 foot tall hospital into this already crowded campus? Already the campus is susceptible to being blocked by a major earthquake. Hospitals are closing all over America, leaving vast portions of the Bay Area unserved.

And the plans for the next 30 years do not take into account all the changes that the COVID-19 virus is making in where people live, work, and how they travel.

Please advise UCSF to hold broad public meetings and to put money on the table.

It's become clear that UCSF has intended all along to greatly expand the Parnassus campus. UCSF offers no plan changes; it only seeks to channel public discussions to “community benefits.”

NEW HOSPITAL

For example, we requested an Advisory Committee session focused on the proposed hospital. When I asked Chancellor Hawgood about scheduling such a session, he emphasized the need to rush hospital approvals and said we can discuss hospital design later.

Hospital location may not be up for discussion, but hospital size and rationale should be, prior to Parnassus plans moving forward at the Planning Commission and to the Board of Regents.

In the past, UC has told the CAG and AC that much of future medical education could be via remote learning. UC has told us that much future patient care will likely be done in ambulatory centers, not hospitals. We see hospitals closing nationally, and even here in the Bay Area.

UC's plans for Parnassus calls for an even denser campus than today. So far, UC's plans don't show the significant changes responding to the covid-19 pandemic. UC should be making the same changes that business, community offices, and government facilities are making include PPE, six feet of separation between people, and massive hourly/daily cleaning work. Scientists predict more epidemics and pandemics.

Only a few years ago, UCSF's 2014 Long Range Development Plan, called for a new hospital of 300,000 gsf, one third the size of today's proposal. And Somewhere between the approval of that LRDP and today, the hospital has ballooned in size. We still haven't been given an explanation.

We did learn, from a Regents' committee meeting notes, that UCSF is proposing to increase its 'market share' of various categories of patients, by up to 30% more. The city of San Francisco should not bear the costs of UCSF's ambitions.

We do know that a tiny fraction of the number of COVID-19 cases required hospitalization. A giant hospital is not warranted.

BROKEN PROMISES

About 10 years ago, UCSF told the Community Advisory Group, that all of its growth would be at Mission Bay. Two new hospitals, labs, and classrooms were planned, about 1.5 million gsf. Nonetheless, we have seen a number of additions to Mission Bay/Dogpatch areas since.

Now UC has proposed to shoehorn another 1.5 million gsf into Parnassus. This represents about a 40% increase in gross square footage in such a landlocked campus. Doing so plans to break the 50+ year Space Ceiling agreement with San Francisco for both size and average daily population.

TRANSPORTATION

Such a massive addition to this small hilltop site will cause substantial impacts on the city of San
Francisco, immediate neighbors, and those living on the travel routes of construction vehicles, TNCs, and delivery vehicles. UCSF must sign an agreement with the City of San Francisco that fully mitigates the housing and transportation impacts of such growth. UCSF should be required to make a massive investment in MUNI. No one arrives at Parnassus by helicopter!

HOUSING

In addition, San Francisco already lacks enough affordable housing for very low to middle income residents. UCSF plans to add 4,000 to its workforce in the first ten years. In addition, another 4,000 faculty and students. So, any other institution, such as Sutter Health would be asked to provide up to 25% affordable housing units. 25% of 8,000 would be supplying 2,000 housing units, just to compensate San Francisco for the burden of its planned expansion.

UCSF offers a proposal to build 504 housing units on the isolated Aldea housing site, and 430 housing units on its west side. At best, it would be half of the needed housing. And there is a need for affordable housing now for graduate students and faculty. There is no commitment in this “plan”: UCSF says it is in the education business, not the housing business. Any developer would be required to do much more. And UCSF says that the proposed housing may be built by some third party, not at their expense.

WHY THE RUSH?

UCSF needs the agreements of neighboring communities who will bear the construction, operation, and transportation impacts of the proposed expansion. They don't have it now. Inner Sunset neighbors have borne the current construction traffic starting as early as 3am.

Other neighborhoods along major travel routes haven't had the opportunity to hear the benefits and issues. San Francisco residents already experience clogged travel routes.

Until the covid-19 emergency abates enough, the Mayor's office and the Board of Supervisors cannot devote sufficient time and thought to Parnassus expansion impacts, and obtain UC's written commitments. The broader communities that live near the campus and along travel routes need time to learn about the plan and express their opinions. Few members of the public have have even cursory information of the plan and its potential impacts, while they deal with shelter in place, and loss of employment [100,000 San Franciscans lost their jobs due to the virus and shelter in place orders.]

The Chancellor said there is barely a month in the ten-year hospital plan for more public involvement. UCSF is planning to get their EIR certified by the Board of Regents in November - keeping their original timeline despite the pandemic and insufficient public involvement.

Please urge UCSF to get more community and government participation now rather than create public dissension and unnecessary litigation.

Tes Welborn  
D5 Resident  
Member, Community Advisory Committee, and Advisory Committee
Dear Sir:

While as a state institution UCSF is generally not subject to the jurisdiction of the City, in such as confined area as San Francisco there are serious impacts to the City infrastructure which will put a burden, financial and otherwise, on the City far into the future.

I have been to the community meetings, and the actual plans and actual neighborhood impacts are brushed aside in favor of painting a rosy picture of a utopian future. The City would be wise to consider what the actual plans will mean.
It's a hospital, not a convention center! Many, if not most, of the patients are not healthy enough to take public transportation like MUNI. Some arrive in ambulance, but most arrive in private cars.

**Insolvency of Uber and Lyft**: While Uber and Lyft are promoted by UCSF as ways to get to the hospital, there should be some hesitancy on relying on these private companies. Both Uber and Lyft are operating at a loss. How long can they continue to exist if they don't make money? How long will they be around?

The COVID-19 pandemic has shown that public transportation, Uber and Lyft involve significant risks to the drivers.

Keep in mind while some of the patients are not ambulatory, some of the diseases are more than ambulatory, they are airborne.

**Airborn diseases** like COVID-19 bring another risk to San Francisco and in particular to the Inner Sunset neighborhood. How is virus contaminated air filtered/decontaminated before it is released into the surrounding air?

Turning to another issue, *The Parnassus property is riddled with landslide risks*. See the Haneberg Lidar study for more details.

The HSIR buildings appear to be located in a large swale on the foot of an old landslide. It is proposed that these buildings be renovated. The parking garages and the Library on the north side of the campus are also at risk.

In an earthquake these buildings will be shaken by vertical and horizontal forces through their foundations, but they may likely be subject to lateral forces from Mt. Sutro landslides. UCSF has not provided any analysis of landslide and their buildings' ability to withstand these shear forces.

**Who will send the emergency response when something happens?** It will be the City police and Fire Departments.

To make matters worse *UCSF plans to put in three roads along the south side of the campus between the HSIR buildings and the Mt. Sutro Forest Reserve*. The purpose of the roads behind the HSIR buildings is to connect Medical Center Way and the new hospital with Kirkham Street. This will mean that there will be traffic along Kirkham street 24/7 because the hospital operates 24/7. And an increase in the size of UCSF in general means an increase in truck traffic supporting the new hospital, labs, etc.

These trucks, semis, garbage trucks generally try to arrive in the middle of the night so they don't impact the daytime operation of UCSF. For example the garbage is picked up behind the Dental building from 4AM to 5AM.

**These three back roads roads will need to be cut and fill, and they will be located in a known landslide area.**

This brings up another issue. **How will the delivery trucks, patients, ambulances, etc. get**
to the UCSF campus? This impacts the City. It is a City problem.

The Inner Sunset neighborhood has a restricted access. This is because of geography. It doesn't have wide streets providing easy access by lots of traffic. UCSF itself is built on an extremely steep hill, Mt. Sutro. The Inner Sunset area only began to see much development after the Sunset Tunnel was built for the N-Judah. Now the N-Judah is at capacity.

**What about widening 7th Avenue?** In the 1950's when there was a plan to put freeways everywhere, the City of San Francisco's own study determined that they "couldn't go full freeway on 7th Avenue" because the surrounding "hills", i.e., Mt. Sutro made widening 7th Avenue impossible. Not only would widening 7th Avenue/Laguna Honda require Moving mountains, it would also require the demolition of houses along 7th Avenue. Does the City want to spend the money?

**What about widening Lincoln Way?** To widen Lincoln Way there are two choices take out a row of houses or take land away from Golden Gate Park. There would be quite an uproar with either of these solutions, and the cost would be enormous.

What will be the impact that the proposed increase in pedestrian, bicycle, and vehicle traffic will have on existing parking?

How will parking be impacted with respect to peak usage during the work week, on weekends, and during major events in Golden Gate Park?

UCSF needs to consider the actual construction.

**Please ask UCSF to analyze the number of dewatering tanks, pumps, and filtration tanks necessary for these projects. Please include the plans for excavation and use (duration and lay down area (where they will be located)).**

**Please ask UCSF to give an acoustical analysis for the use of the dewatering equipment ("Baker Pumps") which will be going 24/7 for the duration until foundations are dug and pored approximately a year and a half for each project.**

**Please ask UCSF to analyze the use of sound enclosures tested to meet Contractors Pump Bureau (CPB) Standards.**

UCSF needs to be able to tell the City what the impacts will be both during and after construction.

Other issues:

**Does UC Hall qualify for historic building designation?** The foundation was shored up in the late 1940’s. This foundation work was done by the famous civil engineer Henry L. Marchand.

Let’s look at some recently built structures. The Trans Bay Terminal was shut down two weeks after it opened. There were many problems with the Bay Bridge. And, of course, how can we forget the beautiful, lavish, luxurious Millennium Tower.
They don't build them like they used to. We don’t want UCSF Parnassus to follow these recent examples.

The renovation of the Medical Sciences building is many years overdue. What is the guarantee that any new UCSF construction will be better managed?

The 1899 wildfire on Mt. Sutro fire stopped just short of the Affiliated Colleges. The 1934 wildfire was fought by 400 firemen. Fire on Mt. Sutro is a serious issue in this urban environment. **What are the UCSF plans for fighting such a wildfire when it breaks out?**

**How is UCSF going to manage the water run off from the new buildings and changes to the pavement.**

There is a constant water flow under Saunders Court, and there are seasonal rivers off of Mt. Sutro in all directions which affect all of the Parnassus campus.

Ground water needs to be observed by borings made during wet years. For example, borings taken in 2013 are inaccurate because 2013 was the year of the lowest rainfall since 1994. Further 2013 was proceeded by the two next lowest rainfall years, 2011 and 2012. (UCSF Draft management Plan (TAC Draft) Mr. Sutro Open Space Reserve.

Borings taken after years of severe drought cannot accurately show the water seepage of the area.

**Please ask UCSF to analyze the access to ambulance bays from Medical Center Way vs. access from Parnassus.** The AASHTO Green Book states, “A traditional rectilinear street grid provides direct connections and multiple routes and thus has high connectivity.” “Emergency service providers have also expressed concern over low-connectivity networks, which may contribute to longer response times and limit the number of routes for emergency access or evacuation.”

Thank you for your consideration of these issues.

Sincerely,

Pamela Hofmann
Dear Sirs and Madams,

I am a long term resident on 5th Avenue adjacent to the UCSF Parnassus Heights campus. I submit these comments regarding SF Planning Commission Meeting June 4, 2020, Agenda Item UCSF presentation of its “CPHP,” for your consideration.

The MOU

It is critically important that professionals from the Planning Department fully engage in the development of a new MOU (Memo of Understanding) with UCSF. I have attended several of UCSF’s community engagement meetings regarding the Comprehensive Parnassus Heights Plan (CPHP). They are not a substitute for the professional skills of City planners. Rather, the meetings leave an impression they are a tactical device to avoid analysis by City professionals.

Community members such as me recognize that the CPHP will make large impacts on transportation, housing, open space, and utilities. However we lack the expertise to quantify the impacts, determine appropriate mitigations and most of all the cost of these mitigations.

I fear that for transportation and housing, suitable mitigation from CPHP impacts may not be possible. We need City analysis.

UCSF’s “Planning Principles” largely seek to bypass scrutiny from City planners. A description of these principles is available here:

https://www.ucsf.edu/sites/default/files/Dogpatch_Project_Summary_and_Cushioning_Action_Plan_10232017.pdf

These principles were used in UCSF’s Mission Bay development. The principles described in the above link arbitrarily weaken the principles of the 1987 MOU between UCSF and the City. Mr. Dennis Antenore submitted a copy of the 1987 MOU for your review. The 1987 MOU provides a standard to be used.
Three of the five principles (1, 2 and 5) in the above link seek to engage community members without City participation. They are a transparent attempt to avoid scrutiny by City professionals.

Principle 3 (“Cushioning of impacts”) is presented as “and/or” engagement with community groups and the City. The expertise of the PUC, MTA, Planning Commission and other City Departments is needed to understand impacts this development will have, and the costs of mitigations. Community groups do not offer a qualified substitute. “Cushioning” is the term UCSF uses to avoid the word “mitigation” and therefore avoid legal accountability.

Principle 4 (“Proportional Share Funding”) is fine – but only if impacts are properly measured and “mitigation”, not “cushioning” is the standard of accountability.

The City may have more leverage in negotiating with UCSF than is superficially apparent. Without an MOU that specifies otherwise, during the next drought UCSF should be held to the same water restrictions imposed on everyone else. During the last drought, this was a 25% reduction in water consumption.

My understanding is water restrictions may be even more severe with the next drought. At minimum, water usage restriction is an important MOU bargaining chip for the City that should not be given away without significant concessions from UCSF. At maximum, there is a serious question: “In the next drought, will there be enough water to support the proposed larger hospital and campus?”

Nonsensical questions, such as "Does UCSF expect people carrying an infectious disease to travel using public transit" or "will a woman giving birth travel to the hospital on a bicycle" only arise because that seems to be the plan.

The hospital

UCSF’s large hospital expansion plan coincides with closures of medical facilities on the northern peninsula. Seton Medical Center in Daly City has 357 beds and employs close to 1,500 workers. Seton Medical Center stuff warn of a "medical desert" in northern San Mateo County should the hospital close. Closure of this facility would provide a rationale for UCSF’s hospital expansion but does not serve the needs of the Bay Area. UCSF’s CPHP failed to consider the most first, most basic decision regarding hospital expansion: “Make or buy?”

The Bay Area would be better served by UCSF stepping in to save Seton Medical and downsizing the CPHP rather than pursuing its current plan. Adding Seton Medical Center to the UCSF system would create a triangle including Mission Bay and Parnassus Heights. Highway 280 is an efficient route between Mission Bay and Seton Medical. Travel time from Seton Medical to Parnassus Heights would be roughly the same as travel between Parnassus Heights and Mission Bay.

California taxpayers would be saved considerable cost if an already built hospital in part substituted for oversized construction on the difficult Parnassus Heights site. Given the prospect of budget shortfalls for years to come, cost is an important consideration. Additional UCSF hospital space could come on-line much more quickly if Seton Medical is added to the system than if an oversized hospital is built in Parnassus Heights.

While it is not the purview of the City and County of San Francisco to perform an analysis including Seton Medical, a City recommendation to the Regents of California to do so would serve the interests of both the City and the greater Bay Area.

In summary, UCSF has focused inwards to its own needs at the expense of community needs. UCSF has not been transparent with its plan, and its community engagement has been superficial. Community members in the Inner Sunset, citizens of San Francisco and the Bay Area are counting on the City for proactive participation with UCSF to amend the CPHP so it not only serves UCSF’s interests, but serves the interests of the citizens of San Francisco.

Respectfully submitted,

Roger Hofmann

June 3, 2020
Dear David Weissglass and Planning Commission Secretary,

The developer wants to add a 4th floor to the building with 8 additional bedrooms and 8 additional bathrooms along with four roof decks. The proposal goes against the Planning Code and the Residential Building Guidelines and so the developer seeks to have the Planning Commission overrule the Planning Dept and the Zoning Administrator. If approved it would set several terrible precedents for the Westside of the city.

It would allow an already non-conforming building (has only a 10 foot backyard) to add a 4th floor in a non-commercial neighborhood of 2 and 3 story buildings.

Even without a 4th story it's already been approved to go from 20 to 40 bedrooms. This proposal would add another 8 bedrooms (and 8 bathrooms) to make 48 bedrooms. i.e. a 140% total increase in rentable bedrooms.

To create additional bedrooms, all parking has been eliminated by adding 5 ADUs in the former garage. This puts the burden of tenant parking on a neighborhood where there is
just no parking today and sidewalks are already full of parked cars every evening. The neighborhood will pay the price of the developers increased profits coming from eliminating parking and adding additional units.

Common space within the units are being minimized to create more rentable bedrooms in order to increase profits.

The proposal requests approval for four 4th floor roof decks which will create noise and nighttime light issues for neighboring homes and danger from falling objects. Again, the developers profit at neighborhood cost.

Regarding loss of views, light and air; the developer says that although it will "suck for us" he says he has no hesitation about adding to the value of his property by subtracting from the value of others if the system allows him to do so.

The developers promised us in early April that they would not go ahead with the 4th floor proposal and then a month later went ahead with it anyway. We, the immediate neighbors, lost a month of time from what would have been spent better understanding what was happening and marshaling opposition. And with shelter-in-place it has been extremely difficult to take on this challenge.

Best regards,

Larry Delaney
1279 44th Ave
Dear David Weissglass and SF Planning Commission Secretary,

Please accept this letter from Tom Zimberoff (cc'd here) as a letter of opposition to the proposed additional development at 4326-4336 Irving St.

Best Regards,

Larry

-----Original Message-----
From: Tom Zimberoff <tom@zimberoff.com>
To: Marstaff (BOS) <marstaff@sfgov.org>
Sent: Tue, Jun 2, 2020 10:53 am
Subject: Re: Meeting about permit

Dear Supervisor Mar & staff,
Attached is a letter, supported by many Outer Sunset residents living adjacent to a re-development project on Irving Street, between 45th and 44th Avenues. Kindly give it your consideration.

Thank you,

Tom Zimberoff

Tom Zimberoff
1364 45th Avenue
San Francisco, California 94122
https://medium.com/@zimberoff
(415) 246-2417

This electronic mail message and any attached files contain information intended for the exclusive use of the individual or entity to which it is addressed and may contain information that is proprietary, privileged, confidential and/or exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any viewing, copying, disclosure or distribution of this information may be subject to legal restriction or sanction. Unintended recipients are prohibited from taking action on the basis of information in this email. Please notify the sender, by electronic mail or telephone, of any unintended recipients and delete the original message without making any copies.
I'm a 20+ year resident and property owner in the Inner Sunset and live/work within three blocks of the Parnassus campus.

I've participated as an advisory committee member in public outreach meetings held nearly every month since August of 2019 and after careful consideration, I support the CPHP project.

In particular, I support the addition of 750 units of new housing, the re-design and improvement of the Irving and Arguello/2nd Avenue entrance and prioritization of a new hospital in the multi year plan.

Now is the time for neighbors/residents/UCSF community staff, with support from our elected representatives, to focus on mitigation and community investment projects. Unless we make this next step a priority, the surrounding neighborhoods and the CCSF will be the big losers on this project.
Please take this into consideration as you hear UCSF's presentation.

Respectfully,

Andrea Jadwin
1388 6th Avenue
Commission Affairs
San Francisco Planning Department
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400 San Francisco, CA 94103
Direct: 415.575.9111 | www.sfplanning.org
San Francisco Property Information Map

REDUCED CAPACITY DURING THE SHELTER IN PLACE ORDER -- The Planning Department is open for business. Most of our staff are working from home and we’re available by e-mail. Our Public Portal, where you can file new applications, and our award-winning Property Information Map are available 24/7. Similarly, the Board of Appeals and Board of Supervisors are accepting appeals via e-mail despite office closures. To protect everyone’s health, all of our in-person services at 1650 and 1660 Mission Street are suspended, and the Planning and Historic Preservation Commissions are cancelled until April 9, at the earliest. Click here for more information.

From: aeboken <aeboken@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, June 03, 2020 4:34 PM
To: CPC-Commissions Secretary <commissions.secretary@sfgov.org>; Koppel, Joel (CPC) <joel.koppel@sfgov.org>; Johnson, Milicent (CPC) <milicent.johnson@sfgov.org>; Moore, Kathrin (CPC) <kathrin.moore@sfgov.org>; Diamond, Susan (CPC) <sue.diamond@sfgov.org>; Fung, Frank (CPC) <frank.fung@sfgov.org>; Imperial, Theresa (CPC) <theresa.imperial@sfgov.org>; deland.chan@sfgov.org
Subject: Fwd: OPPOSING 4326 - 4336 Irving Street

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

TO: SF Planning Commission members and Secretary

Please refer to the email below sent to David Weissglass.

Eileen Boken
President
Sunset-Parkside Education and Action Committee (SPEAK)

Sent from my Verizon, Samsung Galaxy smartphone

-------- Original message --------
From: aeboken <aeboken@gmail.com>
Hi David,

Sunset-Parkside Education and Action Committee (SPEAK) is opposing not only the variance but also the proposed 4th story vertical addition.

The original structure from the 1960s is not only a Sunset Special. With a lot width of 60 feet, it also has a massing which is already inconsistent with the character of the neighborhood.

The project sponsor has already received approvals for a 41.6% increase in the number of dwelling units. The unit count has already increased from 12 to 17.

Of the current 17 dwelling units, 2 are already non-conforming in terms of the dwelling unit exposure requirement. Two out of 17 units is the equivalent of 11.7%

The proposal would intensify the non-compliance of these two units.

The proposed use of multiple spiral staircases could raise concerns regarding egress.

SPEAK agrees with Department staff that the existing building is already overbuilt, that the proposed vertical does not add any dwelling units and that there are no exceptional or extraordinary circumstances for non-compliance with the Residential Design Guidelines.

That being said, SPEAK does not support the staff recommendations for the 4th story vertical addition, but rather opposes the vertical addition in its entirety.

Eileen Boken, President
Dear SF Planning Commission Secretary,

Please accept this email/photos as a letter of opposition to the proposal to add a 4th floor addition to the building at 4326-4336 Irving St. These photos show how bad parking in this block already is today and which would be worsened by the addition of extra bedrooms and resultant extra occupancy by a 4th floor addition.

I already sent this to David Weissglass (cc'd here) but it missed the staff report cutoff so sending directly to the commissioners.
Best regards,

Larry Delaney
1279 44th Ave
From: Denis Mosgofian <denismosgofian@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, June 03, 2020 1:47 PM
To: CPC-Commissions Secretary <commissions.secretary@sfgov.org>
Cc: Switzky, Joshua (CPC) <joshua.switzky@sfgov.org>
Subject: Comment: Case Number: 2020-002347CWP

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

Comment to the Planning Commission
HEARING DATE: JUNE 4, 2020
UCSF Comprehensive Parnassus Heights Plan (CPHP)
Case Number: 2020-002347CWP
Staff Contact: Joshua Switzky, Land Use & Community Planning Program Manager
(415) 575-6815, joshua.switzky@sfgov.org

Dear Planning Commissioners,

I wish to call your attention to the enormous shift of responsibility the University of California at San Francisco intends to transfer to the people of San Francisco, and to the City and County of San Francisco by its proposal to expand the space ceiling at UCSF by 1.5 msf, and to refuse to commit to building affordable housing for its greatly expanded future workforce, and to refuse to pay for the actual mitigation expenses which the City will inevitably incur over many decades.
Because UCSF is exempted from paying taxes to the City, exempted from helping pay down the bonds the City borrows to pay for infrastructure, is exempted from local obligations to construct housing affordable proportionate to its expanded building envelope, is exempted from in lieu fees for housing, is exempted from SFMTA transit obligations, UCSF is counting on being able to shift these ongoing burdens to the City.

Further, UCSF is attempting to preempt being obligated to pay for inevitable mandatory mitigation measures by inventing the cutesy term, “cushioning action plan”, to conceal its huge long term impacts.

UCSF, while absolutely depending upon the City to provide endless services, is counting on being able to shift these burdens onto the people of San Francisco.

I asked myself to look at this proposed development as if it were a private developer. The net expansion of 2.05 msf, the equivalent of adding a Salesforce Tower onto Parnassus Avenue, would, I believe, never get City or public approval. And even if scaled down appropriately, it would be met with myriad financial and other mitigations.

I urge the members of the Planning Commission take a hard look at the impacts of such a gigantic expansion of the existing UCSF footprint in a residential area, and to advise the City to insist on it building affordable housing and committing to long term financial mitigation for City provided transit, traffic and other services.

Thank you for your consideration of these concerns,

Denis Mosgofian

1227 - 10th Avenue

SF 94122
Dear Commission Secretary,

Could you please forward the attached document to the Planning Commissioners so they will have it before the hearing tomorrow at 1:00? Thanks you. B

--

*Barbara Delaney*
Commission Affairs
San Francisco Planning Department
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400 San Francisco, CA 94103
Direct: 415.575.9111 | www.sfplanning.org
San Francisco Property Information Map

REDUCED CAPACITY DURING THE SHELTER IN PLACE ORDER -- The Planning Department is open for business. Most of our staff are working from home and we're available by e-mail. Our Public Portal, where you can file new applications, and our award-winning Property Information Map are available 24/7. Similarly, the Board of Appeals and Board of Supervisors are accepting appeals via e-mail despite office closures. To protect everyone's health, all of our in-person services at 1650 and 1660 Mission Street are suspended, and the Planning and Historic Preservation Commissions are cancelled until April 9, at the earliest. Click here for more information.

From: Dennis Antenore <antenored@earthlink.net>
Sent: Wednesday, June 03, 2020 4:04 PM
To: Ionin, Jonas (CPC) <jonas.ionin@sfgov.org>; CPC-Commissions Secretary <commissions.secretary@sfgov.org>
Subject: Statement Of Dennis Antenore re: UCSF expansion plans with attachements June 4, 2020
Importance: High

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

Jonas: I hope this finds you well and that you are staying safe and healthy. Attached is a copy of the statement I am submitting for the hearing on UCSF plans tomorrow with attachments. Please provide them to the Commission for the hearing tomorrow. Thanks so much, Dennis
Dear Commissioners,

This letter is to request that you direct the Planning Department to do an analysis of five California Senate bills **(SB 902, 995, 1085, 1120, and 1385)** as soon as possible. These bills are being rushed through the shortened legislative session in Sacramento which gives less time for public review, comment, and hearings. These bills could have a disproportionate impact on San Franciscans - tenants and homeowners alike - as well as to further undermine environmental protections under CEQA. They could possibly devastate our communities.

The public needs to understand the good and bad impacts of each of these
bills. We rely on the Planning Department staff to provide us with objective reviews of what each bill means for San Franciscans. Time is of the essence to perform this analysis.

Thank you for your support to keep the public informed on these bills.

Sincerely,

Nancy Wuerfel
Dear Planning Commission,

I hope you are all staying safe and well during these difficult times for our city and country.

On behalf of the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce, please see attached for our letter of support for the UCSF Comprehensive Parnassus Heights Plan.

Sincerely,

Emily

Emily Abraham
Public Policy Manager
SF Chamber of Commerce
Dear Planning Commissioners:

I urge you to direct the Planning Department to immediately analyze the following state housing bills: SB902, SB995, SB1085, SB1120, and SB1385. These bills are detrimental to San Francisco, which already adheres to all pro-housing requirements and moreover exceeds those requirements, and even further, we have our own incentives already in place. Moreover, there are 64,000 units already approved for construction in San Francisco, and therefore our energies should be focused on moving forward the process to actually build those units. Finally, the advent of Covid-19 has dramatically and likely permanently reduced the demand for housing in San Francisco, and this must be taken into account.

Thank you.

Jason Jungreis
527 47th Avenue
San Francisco, CA  94121
Commissioners,

Please be advised that Waller will be continued.

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: "Winslow, David (CPC)" <david.winslow@sfgov.org>
Date: Wednesday, June 3, 2020 at 6:02 PM
To: "Ionin, Jonas (CPC)" <jonas.ionin@sfgov.org>
Cc: "Gordon-Jonckheer, Elizabeth (CPC)" <elizabeth.gordon-jonckheer@sfgov.org>
Subject: FW: 440-448 Waller DR hearing continuance request

Jonas,

Please see below for request for continuance to June 11- acceptable to both parties

David Winslow
Principal Architect
Design Review | Citywide and Current Planning
San Francisco Planning Department
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400 | San Francisco, California, 94103
T: (415) 575-9159

The Planning Department is open for business during the Shelter in Place Order. Most of our staff are working from home and we're available by e-mail. Our Public Portal, where you can file new applications, and our Property Information Map are available 24/7. The Planning Commission is convening remotely and the public is encouraged to participate. The Board of Appeals and Board of Supervisors are accepting appeals via e-mail despite office closures. All of our in-person services at 1650 and 1660 Mission Street are suspended until further notice. Click here for more information.

From: Tom Drohan <tomedrohan@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, June 03, 2020 5:51 PM
To: Winslow, David (CPC) <david.winslow@sfgov.org>
Cc: Jody Knight <jknigh@reubenlaw.com>
Subject: Re: 440-448 Waller hearing
Yes, acceptable. This is a good idea. I started a trial this week and have not had much time to attend to this. My hope is that with this extra time we will be able to reach an agreement and take it off the calendar. Thanks, Tom

On Wed, Jun 3, 2020 at 5:05 PM Winslow, David (CPC) <david.winslow@sfgov.org> wrote:

Is this acceptable to both parties?

David Winslow  
Principal Architect  
Design Review | Citywide and Current Planning  
San Francisco Planning Department  
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400 | San Francisco, California, 94103  
T: (415) 575-9159

The Planning Department is open for business during the Shelter in Place Order. Most of our staff are working from home and we’re available by e-mail. Our Public Portal, where you can file new applications, and our Property Information Map are available 24/7. The Planning Commission is convening remotely and the public is encouraged to participate. The Board of Appeals and Board of Supervisors are accepting appeals via e-mail despite office closures. All of our in-person services at 1650 and 1660 Mission Street are suspended until further notice. Click here for more information.

Hi David and Elizabeth, we would like to request a one week continuance to try to finalize settlement. Should I email Jonas and/or request when continuances are called tomorrow? Thanks!

REUBEN, JUNIUS & ROSE, LLP

Jody Knight  
Partner
  T. (415) 567-9000
  F. (415) 399-9480
  jknight@reubenlaw.com
  www.reubenlaw.com

SF Office:  
One Bush Street, Suite 600  
San Francisco, CA  94104

Oakland Office:  
456 8th Street, 2nd Floor  
Oakland, CA  94607
From: CPC-Commissions Secretary
Cc: Feliciano, Josephine (CPC)
Subject: FW: Concerning 4326-4336 Irving St Building
Date: Wednesday, June 03, 2020 12:23:03 PM

Commission Affairs
San Francisco Planning Department
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400 San Francisco, CA 94103
Direct: 415.575.9111 | www.sfplanning.org
San Francisco Property Information Map

REDUCED CAPACITY DURING THE SHELTER IN PLACE ORDER -- The Planning Department is open for business. Most of our staff are working from home and we’re available by e-mail. Our Public Portal, where you can file new applications, and our award-winning Property Information Map are available 24/7. Similarly, the Board of Appeals and Board of Supervisors are accepting appeals via e-mail despite office closures. To protect everyone’s health, all of our in-person services at 1650 and 1660 Mission Street are suspended, and the Planning and Historic Preservation Commissions are cancelled until April 9, at the earliest. Click here for more information.

From: Aaron Nudelman <ron.elman@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, June 03, 2020 12:22 PM
To: Weissglass, David (CPC) <david.weissglass@sfgov.org>; CPC-Commissions Secretary <commissions.secretary@sfgov.org>
Subject: Concerning 4326-4336 Irving St Building

Hello and thank you for your consideration of the following.

- We live at 1284 44th Ave, for approximately 15 years, around the corner from the proposed building project at 4326-4336 Irving.
- We share in the written concerns (5/22 Letter from the Delaneys and the Lees) about the proposed project and its potentially devastating and irreversible effects on the neighborhood.
- We are especially opposed to the construction of a 4th floor on the building for reasons including that the view of the ocean from our upper deck (we have no usable yard) will be permanently blocked and instead of a sunset and rooftops, we'll see an eyesore and some sky.

Thanks again for your time and attention, and help with this city-altering matter.

-Aaron Nudelman
Hi there,

I support the Conditional Use of 764 Stanyan for cannabis retail use as described in the Notice of Public Hearing (attached). Living in the neighborhood (on Shrader Street) and with a member of the household that uses cannabis for medical purposes ... and as a believer that as long as you are not breaking the law you should be able to do what you want with your own property ... I fully support this initiative.

Thanks for your consideration.

Chris Hock
Commission Affairs  
San Francisco Planning Department  
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400  
San Francisco, CA 94103  
Direct: 415.575.9111 | www.sfplanning.org  
San Francisco Property Information Map

REDUCED CAPACITY DURING THE SHELTER IN PLACE ORDER -- The Planning Department is open for business. Most of our staff are working from home and we’re available by e-mail. Our Public Portal, where you can file new applications, and our award-winning Property Information Map are available 24/7. Similarly, the Board of Appeals and Board of Supervisors are accepting appeals via e-mail despite office closures. To protect everyone’s health, all of our in-person services at 1650 and 1660 Mission Street are suspended, and the Planning and Historic Preservation Commissions are cancelled until April 9, at the earliest. Click here for more information.

From: Christensen, Michael (CPC) <michael.christensen@sfgov.org>  
Sent: Wednesday, June 03, 2020 10:04 AM  
To: Deland Chan <delandsf@gmail.com>; Koppel, Joel (CPC) <joel.koppel@sfgov.org>; Moore, Kathrin (CPC) <kathrin.moore@sfgov.org>; Diamond, Susan (CPC) <sue.diamond@sfgov.org>; Fung, Frank (CPC) <frank.fung@sfgov.org>; Imperial, Theresa (CPC) <theresa.imperial@sfgov.org>; Johnson, Milicent (CPC) <milicent.johnson@sfgov.org>  
Cc: CPC-Commissions Secretary <commissions.secretary@sfgov.org>  
Subject: 667 Mississippi / 2019-014211DRP CORRECTED PACKET

Hello Commissioners,

There was an error in publishing the packets for your DR hearing item at 667 Mississippi Street for tomorrow’s hearing. The correct packet is attached, and corrected copies have been provided to interested parties and published online. This updated packet reflects discussions between the DR requestor and Project Sponsor.

Thank you,

Regards,

Michael Christensen, Senior Planner | 415.575.8742  
San Francisco Planning Department, SE Quadrant Team  
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400  
San Francisco, CA 94103

The Planning Department is open for business during the Stay Safe at Home Order. Most of our staff are working from home and we’re available by e-mail. Our Public Portal, where you can file new applications, and our Property Information Map are available 24/7. The Planning and Historic
Preservation Commissions are convening remotely and the public is encouraged to participate. The Board of Appeals, Board of Supervisors, and Planning Commission are accepting appeals via e-mail despite office closures. All of our in-person services at 1650 and 1660 Mission Street are suspended until further notice. Click here for more information.
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: aidan Offermann <awesomoshis@hotmail.com>
Date: Tuesday, June 2, 2020 at 2:31 PM
To: "Fung, Frank (CPC)" <frank.fung@sfgov.org>, "joel.koppel@sfgov.org" <joel.koppel@sfgov.org>, "Ionin, Jonas (CPC)" <jonas.ionin@sfgov.org>, CPC-Commissions Secretary <commissions.secretary@sfgov.org>, Kathrin Moore <mooreurban@aol.com>, "Johnson, Milicent (CPC)" <milicent.johnson@sfgov.org>
Subject: Please direct Planning Dept to analyze state housing bills ASAP - SB 902, 995, 1085, 1120, and 1385

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

Hi there. My name is Aidan Offermann, i currently live in zipcode 94117 and will be moving to 94110 soon. I am asking that the Planning Department bring in experts to analyze the bills SB 902, 995, 1085, and 1385. Bills like this should not be rushed through without scrupulous revision.

Best,

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

June 2, 2020

President Joel Koppel
and Honorable Commissioners
Joel Koppel, President
Kathrin Moore
Sue Diamond
Frank S. Fung
Theresa Imperial
Milicent A. Johnson
Honorable Commissioners:

I am a seven decade resident and native son of the Sunset. My family has roots in San Francisco dating from the 1880’s. We have numerous generations of graduates and athletes who attended and graduated into careers of education, medicine, public service, athletics, business, law and ministry in service to the people of San Francisco from Saint Ignatius College Preparatory. I have served as an Assistant District Attorney ay YGC, Youth Counsellor, Youth Basketball, Soccer and Baseball Coach and Legal and Athletic Club Board Officer and can strongly attest to the value of athletics in young San Franciscans’ positive development and relationships in their lives.

I join with the many Sunset District neighbors, friends and supporters of Saint Ignatius to voice my strong support for approval of the installation and responsible use of night illumination at J.B. Murphy Field at the St. Ignatius College Preparatory campus. These lights are engineered to minimally affect the peace and ambiance of the nearby residential neighborhood. The planned lights will create more options for student athletes and also to allow St. Ignatius to implement a later school start time in accordance to CA State law. The project will align with the requirements and limitations pertinent to the systems that have been allowed and have proven to be as minimally intrusive and successful at Kezar Stadium and Beach Chalet Soccer Fields.

San Francisco high school student athletes have established a traditional of excellence and accomplishment, including State and National Championships in football. The WCAL is a highly respected and competitive league throughout Northern California. The St. Ignatius’ sports program has produced innumerable accomplished men and women student athletes and community leaders. There are too few athletic fields in San Francisco. Permitting S.I. to install these lights will keep students closer to the campus and reduce travel to practice and compete. The field will also be a welcoming venue for families and provide inspiration for children aspiring to high school excellence.

St. Ignatius College Preparatory has been an excellent center of learning that instills a deep commitment of service to others in its diverse and talented students. Many of those lessons are learned through the shared experience on the athletic field. The students who participate as spectators gain a stronger feeling of community responsibility by supporting their friends and fellow classmates.

Please vote YES - to allow the installation and responsible use of lights at J.B. Murphy Field at St. Ignatius College Preparatory.

Very truly yours,

Hugh A. Donohoe
1354 26th Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94122-1527
hugh.a.donohoe@gmail.com

cc: Honorable Gordon Mar - Supervisor - District 4
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: "Peraza, J Mario" <JMario.Peraza@ucsf.edu>
Date: Tuesday, June 2, 2020 at 6:29 PM
To: "Ionin, Jonas (CPC)" <jonas.ionin@sfgov.org>
Cc: Judy Lamberti <j.lamberti@att.net>, "Alden, Amiee (UCSF)" <Amiee.Alden@ucsf.edu>
Subject: Alumni Association of UCSF Support of the CPHP

Hello Secretary Ionin,

On behalf of Dr. Judith Lamberti, Alumni Association of UCSF (AAUCSF) President and the AAUCSF Board of Directors I would like to share the organizations support for the Comprehensive Parnassus Heights Plan.

Thank you,

Mario Peraza
Executive Director of Alumni Relations
University of California San Francisco
415.502.2837
Dear Mayor and Officers - wouldn't a nice waterfront fresh food and other marketplace be good for the San Francisco area?
Dear Mayor and Officers
Wouldn’t a nice waterfront fresh food and other marketplace be good for the San Francisco area – especially near Palo Alto?
It could be large and service the whole area from San Jose, and be connected from the Bay’s east side by ferries from Oakland and points in between. Given the growth and demographic around Palo Alto I think this would definitely be viable and popular.
You could hold a global architectural competition for it.
anyway all the best and I very much look forward to visiting.
john finch
australia
To: Planning Commissioners

I write in support of the proposed project at 4326-4336 Irving Street, item #16 on the June 4th Planning Commission agenda.

While the specific decisions you must make are whether to take discretionary review and grant a variance for the project, please do not lose sight of the overall benefits of the entire project - providing much-needed improved affordable housing in the Sunset District.

In addition to the new units being added (which were previously approved), the project sponsor will be providing new electrical, new plumbing, a new roof, a new fire sprinkler system, new HVAC, and seismic upgrades, among other improvements in this 100% rent controlled building. It is rare to see property owners of 100% rent controlled buildings voluntarily make this level of investment to improve the building and each unit.
This project serves as a great example of how additional affordable housing units can be created with the least amount of impact to the surrounding neighborhood - and particularly in a district where new development is not widely accepted.

Please give more families the opportunity to live in San Francisco and allow this project to move forward as proposed.

Katy Tang
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 <http://www.sfplanning.org/>

On 6/2/20, 6:45 PM, "Jim Lansing" <jlansing@paebell.net> wrote:

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

Dear SF Planning Commission Members:

As a resident of San Francisco, I request that you do an analysis of five bills (SB 902, 995, 1085, and 1385) that are being fast tracked for passage through the legislature in Sacramento and could have a disproportionate impact on San Franciscans. At this point, the public has no idea of their potential impact because there has not been time for public review, comment, and hearing on key bills. They could undermine environmental protections. The public needs to be able to have a reasonable and knowledgeable discussion on the pros and cons before such bills are passed. Because this legislative session is short, the bills are being rushed without public knowledge or discussion. This is not right and you, as planning commission members, can do something about it.

Thank you,

Jim Lansing
Hi,
I hope you are all doing well. We received a notice about a Cannabis Retail and smoke shop at 764 Stanyan St. We adamantly oppose this for numerous reasons. First, this is in the middle of a primarily residential neighborhood with 40-50 kids on just a few surrounding blocks. Next there is a “Safe and Sound” location at 1757 Waller who provides daycare to children of domestic violence sufferers. There are many child care facilities in the immediate area, including one at Kezar where there are day camps for kids and kids sporting events. Finally, there are already plenty of cannabis shops in the close vicinity and we don’t need more.

Of particular concern is the “on site smoking and vaporizing room”.
Thank you,
Stacie Johnson

Sent from my iPad
From: Phillip Kobernick <phillipkobernick@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 2, 2020 12:02 PM
To: CPC-Commissions Secretary <commissions.secretary@sfgov.org>; Ajello Hoagland, Linda (CPC) <linda.ajellohoagland@sfgov.org>; Livia, Diane (CPC) <diane.livia@sfgov.org>; Bintliff, Jacob (BOS) <jacob.bintliff@sfgov.org>; Mandelman, Rafael (BOS) <rafael.mandelman@sfgov.org>; MandelmanStaff, [BOS] <mandelmanstaff@sfgov.org>
Cc: progressnoe@gmail.com
Subject: I *support* new housing at 4512 23rd street (and you should too)

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

Supervisor Mandelman, city planners, and SF Planning Commission,

I’m writing to you as a renter, a younger San Franciscan, and someone who is fortunate enough to live in an ADU in Noe Valley.

My generation, and renters of all ages, are facing enormous pressure from our housing shortage. I’ve had friends that had to choose between starting a family (meaning moving out of a shared apartment with several roommates and finding an apartment where they can build a home) and staying in the city and nearly all have chosen to leave because it’s impossible to find an apartment. Our housing shortage is by design, and we need to fix it or our city will completely lose a generation of young people and those without enormous wealth or inherited property.

We also need to fight back against segregation by design. Homogeneous housing (single-family homes only) has lead to homogenous, mostly white and wealthy, communities. Let's push for more affordable (including subsidized affordable) housing to push back on segregation and displacement. It's clear that we need this now more than ever.

I urge you to approve this housing proposal and more like it. Please don’t change this proposal to deny housing for people because of “concerned” neighbors. Each unit that is lost is another family that is forced out of the city. Is a legacy of exclusion and displacement really the neighborhood...
"character" that we should be making concessions to protect?

Thank you,
Phillip Kobernick
Renter at 26th and Church St.

--
Phillip Kobernick
Dear David Weissglass and SF Planning Commission Secretary,

Please find attached a further nine letters from the neighborhood (signed by twelve individuals) in opposition to the proposed additional development at 4326-4336 Irving St.

Best regards,

Larry

Larry Delaney
1279 44th Ave
Dear Commission Secretary,

I hope this email finds your department well.

Please include my opposing views for the proposed additional development at the property cited above. My opposition to the current design of this project is based on the following:

1. The project does not conform to the existing planning and design codes of San Francisco. My neighbors and I do not want these codes to be ignored for the profit of the developer at the detriment of our neighborhood. Since the minimum standards are not met and the project is not approvable per the Planning Department, it should not be approved.
by the Planning Commission.

2. The proposed fourth story will impact the light, air, and privacy of the neighborhood properties and sets a bad precedent for future development. The current size of the building already blocks sunlight to the properties closest to it (please refer to the Google Earth image attached), and making the building larger will not only block more hours of sunlight to those neighbors but will also start to impact properties farther away.

- The reduced amount of sunlight and airflow leaves the shaded areas damp, which encourages moss growth and wood rot and invites insects including termites, wood beetles, and ants. I speak from firsthand experience while living on Taraval Street. Over the years, neighbors built back into their yards and higher than the common roofline, and buildings left at their original dimensions experienced these issues among others. I witnessed these impacts not only to the house I lived in but also to the houses of neighbors both on Taraval Street and the adjacent avenue blocks.

3. The proposed apartments are not family-friendly, and the excessive density of the units and elimination of garage parking will negatively impact street parking and services in the neighborhood. The parking issue in our area is already very difficult, with those currently living here having to regularly park four avenue blocks (for example, Lawton to Lincoln which is 0.5 miles) away from their homes. The proposed development will exacerbate this problem.

4. The proposal will make the property out of character with our neighborhood of two and three-story homes, especially since it lies in the middle of the block. The property already takes up far more space than any other property on the block.

I understand the need for housing in San Francisco and I support developing units to accommodate more people as the city expands, but this current design is not the way to go about it.

Thank you for including my objections.

AnnaMaria Cantwell
1263 44th Avenue
(415) 302-9933
Dear David Weissglass and Planning Commission Secretary,

Please find attached a two page letter from Denise Selleck of 1375 45th Ave in opposition to the proposed additional development at 4326-4336 Irving St.

Best regards,

Larry

Larry Delaney
1279 44th Ave
San Francisco
(415) 665-5067
Hello Planning Commissioners,

I am writing today in support of building 13 units of homes at 4512 23rd Street. 13 units on this lot is perfectly appropriate. I am happy to see that there is no automobile parking planned as well. This is will reduce air pollution, GHG emissions, noise pollution, and make our streets safer from car collisions. The 37 Corbett, and local bike routes provide excellent access at this location. Given we are in a housing crisis, with 1,272 San Franciscans on our shelter waitlist tonight, and more than 8,000 neighbors sleeping on our streets tonight, we desperately need more homes in San Francisco, especially smaller units like the ones proposed for 4512 23rd Street so people can move into them,
opening up other units for our neighbors to move into.

I saw a paper flyer posted by an anonymous neighbor who only identified themselves with their email address "FairDevTwinPeaks@gmail.com" who opposed this project. In their flyer, they made false claims about the project (for example, they make a false claim that the lack of parking would increase congestion, when in fact, parking-free projects have been proven repeatedly to reduce traffic congestion).

Please approve this project for construction as quickly as possible.

Thanks,
Patrick Traughber
Resident, San Francisco

--

Patrick Traughber
patricktraughber@gmail.com
San Francisco, CA
Commission Affairs
San Francisco Planning Department
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400 San Francisco, CA 94103
Direct: 415.575.9111 | www.sfplanning.org
San Francisco Property Information Map

REDUCED CAPACITY DURING THE SHELTER IN PLACE ORDER -- The Planning Department is open for business. Most of our staff are working from home and we’re available by e-mail. Our Public Portal, where you can file new applications, and our award-winning Property Information Map are available 24/7. Similarly, the Board of Appeals and Board of Supervisors are accepting appeals via e-mail despite office closures. To protect everyone’s health, all of our in-person services at 1650 and 1660 Mission Street are suspended, and the Planning and Historic Preservation Commissions are cancelled until April 9, at the earliest. Click here for more information.

Jonas P. Ionin
Commission Secretary
San Francisco Planning Department
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400
San Francisco, CA 94103
PH: (415) 558-6415 (Assistant)
PH: (415) 558-6309 (Direct)
FX: (415) 558-6409
Commissions.Secretary@sfgov.org

Good day,
Please include my opposing views for Project Address: 4326-4336 Irving Street, Cross Streets: 44th
I object to the current design of this project due to the following reasons:
- Overshadows neighborhood
- Loss of privacy
- Loss of views
- Permanent loss of light to those closest in front and backyards INCLUDING inside homes. Electricity usage will be higher even on sunny days. Homes farther away will have loss of light during the Fall and Winter months.
- Permanent loss of sunlight and air flow will create moss, wood rot and bring about insects, like termites, ants and wood beetles.
(I speak from experience when I lived on Taraval Street. Several neighbors built back into the yards and higher than the common roofline and buildings started experiencing these issues.)
- Where are the parking spaces for these units? It can take an hour to find a parking space here with some having to park four blocks away (Lawton Street). Four Avenue blocks is about a half a mile.
- Taller buildings usually reserved for the corner of a block.

I understand the need for housing, and I support building units to accommodate more people as the city expands, but this is not the way to accomplish it.

Thank you for including my objections.

Katherine Cantwell
1263 44th Avenue
SF, CA, 94122
415-317-4535

Sent from my iPhone
June 2, 2020

President Joel Koppel
and Honorable Commissioners
San Francisco Planning Commission
San Francisco City Hall

VIA EMAIL

Re: Lights at St. Ignatius Field

Dear Commissioners:

I have lived in San Francisco all of my life. I grew up in Forest Hill and currently live in the West Portal Area. I am a graduate of Mercy High School and have two children at Saint Cecilia’s in 5th and 7th grades.

I’m writing in strong support for approval for lights at St. Ignatius Field in order to create more options for later
school start time as required by new CA State Law signed by Governor Newsom.

There are many key benefits to field lights. It will allow kids a safe option to participate in community building Friday night athletic games. These will be on the campus with supervision by faculty, parents and school security to make sure the kids are in a safe and organized event. Even the students who participate as spectators gain a strong feeling of community by supporting their friends and fellow classmates.

Please vote YES! to the lights at St. Ignatius Field and thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Sheila Fonseca
539 Vicente Street
sheilafonseca7@gmail.com
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: Ocean Avenue CBD <info.oacbd@gmail.com>
Date: Monday, June 1, 2020 at 4:32 PM
To: "keith@savelyhealthcarearchitects.com" <keith@savelyhealthcarearchitects.com>
Cc: "Yee, Norman (BOS)" <norman.yee.bos@sfgov.org>, "Low, Jen (BOS)"
  <jen.low@sfgov.org>, "Horn, Jeffrey (CPC)" <jeffrey.horn@sfgov.org>, "Hillis, Rich (CPC)"
  <rich.hillis@sfgov.org>, "Ionin, Jonas (CPC)" <jonas.ionin@sfgov.org>, "joel.koppel@sfgov.org"
  <joel.koppel@sfgov.org>, "Moore, Kathrin (CPC)" <kathrin.moore@sfgov.org>, "Diamond, Susan (CPC)"
  <sue.diamond@sfgov.org>, "Fung, Frank (CPC)" <frank.fung@sfgov.org>, Theresa Imperial <theresa.imperial@sfgov.org>, "Johnson, Milicent (CPC)"
  <milicent.johnson@sfgov.org>
Subject: 1760 Ocean Avenue Conditional Use Permit

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

Please see the attached letter.
Daniel Weaver
Executive Director
Ocean Avenue Association
t: 650-273-6223
e: info.oacbd@gmail.com
This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Please see the attached letter.
Daniel Weaver
Executive Director
Ocean Avenue Association
t: 650-273-6223
e: info.oacbd@gmail.com
Hi all,

On behalf of the Haight Ashbury Neighbors for Density (HAND), please see the attached letter of support for the proposed use at 764 Stanyan.

Thank you

--

Haight Ashbury Neighbors for Density

To opt out of future emails, respond to this email with "unsubscribe"
Dear Planning Commissioners:

I am writing asking for you to support to St. Ignatius College Preparatory’s request to install lights on St. Ignatius' athletic field. This project will greatly benefit the students by allowing them to not be constrained by time, allowing the high school to better meet the needs of the students and to build a greater sense of community. That is what Jesuit education is all about, caring for all the needs of the students, what the Jesuits call *cura personalis*.

Although the school has changed in the 35 years since my graduation from SI,
what hasn’t changed is the idea of *cura personalis*. This lighting project will help the students remain on campus and develop and build those transferable life skills that I learned on the campus through my classes, clubs, plays, liturgies and sports. These lights will bring the St. Ignatius community together and provide additional opportunities for the students on the campus.

I encourage you to consider the St. Ignatius community of students, parents, alumni and friends and vote in favor of the lighting project at St. Ignatius. This project will greatly benefit the St. Ignatius community in providing *cura personalis* for generations of students. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Mark Delucchi, Ph.D.
markdelucchi@yahoo.com
1491 32nd Ave
San Francisco CA  94122
(415) 335-5118
Commission Affairs
San Francisco Planning Department
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400 San Francisco, CA 94103
Direct: 415.575.9111 | www.sfplanning.org
San Francisco Property Information Map

REDUCED CAPACITY DURING THE SHELTER IN PLACE ORDER -- The Planning Department is open for business. Most of our staff are working from home and we’re available by e-mail. Our Public Portal, where you can file new applications, and our award-winning Property Information Map are available 24/7. Similarly, the Board of Appeals and Board of Supervisors are accepting appeals via e-mail despite office closures. To protect everyone’s health, all of our in-person services at 1650 and 1660 Mission Street are suspended, and the Planning and Historic Preservation Commissions are cancelled until April 9, at the earliest. Click here for more information.

From: Elias Gutierrez <sfwindsurfer@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, June 01, 2020 9:39 PM
To: Koppel, Joel (CPC) <joel.koppel@sfgov.org>; Moore, Kathrin (CPC) <kathrin.moore@sfgov.org>; Diamond, Susan (CPC) <sue.diamond@sfgov.org>; Fung, Frank (CPC) <frank.fung@sfgov.org>; Imperial, Theresa (CPC) <theresa.imperial@sfgov.org>; Johnson, Milicent (CPC) <milicent.johnson@sfgov.org>
Cc: Mar, Gordon (BOS) <gordon.mar@sfgov.org>; CPC-Commissions Secretary <commissions.secretary@sfgov.org>; Ionin, Jonas (CPC) <jonas.ionin@sfgov.org>
Subject: Email Letter of Support to SF planning commissioners - Lighting at Saint Ignatius H.S.

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

June 1, 2020

President Joel Koppel
and Honorable Commissioners
San Francisco Planning Commission
San Francisco City Hall

VIA EMAIL

Re: Lights at St. Ignatius Field
Dear Commissioners:

I have lived in San Francisco for almost 55 years, and in that time I have been able to participate and enjoy all the recreational activities afforded to the city's residents. San Francisco's climate allows for kids and adults to partake in sports all year round with the only drawback (besides the fog) being the lack of lighting in the evenings. As a boy growing up in the Richmond District, I participated in team sports throughout the school year and summer, playing until forced to call it a day at dusk. Now as a 20 year resident of the Sunset District and parent of a high schooler at Saint Ignatius College Prep, I am happy to know that the school is considering the installation of lighting at it's fields. This will benefit my son and some of my neighbor's kids as they will be able to play longer and in safer conditions under lights.

I’m writing in strong support for approval of lights at St. Ignatius Field in order to create more options for student athletes and also to allow St. Ignatius to implement a later start time in accordance to CA State law.

There are fewer spaces for students to practice field sports in San Francisco and allowing S.I. to build these lights will keep students closer to the campus rather than traveling great distances to practice.

St. Ignatius College Preparatory has been an excellent center of learning not just to take tests and get good grades but to be in service to others. Many of those lessons are learned through the shared experience on the field. Even the students who participate as spectators gain a strong feeling of community by supporting their friends and fellow classmates.

Please vote YES! to the lights at St. Ignatius Field and thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Esteban Elias Gutierrez
2219 34th Ave
San Francisco CA 94116
sfwindsurfer@yahoo.com
Dear Commissioners,

I am Eric Huang, I have been living in the Sunset district/San Francisco for more than 20 years. I am a parent of a student who is currently attending St. Ignatious.

I’m writing in strong support for approval for lights at St. Ignatious Field in order to create more options for later school start time as required by new CA State Law signed by Governor Newsom. Research studies by the American Academy of Pediatrics have confirmed starting school later in the morning leads to better overall health and school performance. This will be the new normal for most California schools. Another key benefit of the field lights will be allowing kids a safe option to
participate in community building Friday night athletic games. These will be on the campus with supervision by faculty, parents and school security to make sure the kids are in a safe and organized event. Even the students who participate as spectators gain a strong feeling of community by supporting their friends and fellow classmates. Please vote YES! to the lights at St. Ignatius Field and thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Eric Huang
1363 26th Ave,
San Francisco
email: ejhuang11@gmail.com
To Whom It May Concern,

Please see attached brief filed by the DR Requestor for 2020-00909DRP.

Respectfully,

Donald
Dear Commissioners,

My name is Pia Jondonovan. I have lived in the Sunset my whole life and graduated from SI two tears ago in 2018. My grandfather, uncle, and brother attended SI as well so it is important to my family.

I’m writing in strong support for approval of lights at St. Ignatius Field in order to create more options for student athletes and also to allow St. Ignatius to implement a later start time in accordance to CA State law. There are fewer spaces for students to practice field sports in San Francisco and allowing S.I. to build these lights will keep students closer to the campus rather than traveling great distances to practice. St. Ignatius College Preparatory has been an excellent center of learning not just to take tests and get good grades but to be in service to others. Many of those
lessons are learned through the shared experience on the field. Even the students who participate as spectators gain a strong feeling of community by supporting their friends and fellow classmates.

Please vote YES! to the lights at St. Ignatius Field and thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Pia Jondonovan
1670 21st. Ave. San Francisco
jondonovanpi@seattleu.edu
Dear Commissioners,

My name is Pia Jondonovan. I have lived in the Sunset my whole life and graduated from SI two years ago in 2018. My grandfather, uncle, and brother attended SI as well so it is important to my family.

I’m writing in strong support for approval of lights at St. Ignatius Field in order to create more options for student athletes and also to allow St. Ignatius to implement a later start time in accordance to CA State law. There are fewer spaces for students to practice field sports in San Francisco and allowing S.I. to build these lights will keep students closer to the campus rather than traveling great distances to practice. St. Ignatius College Preparatory has been an excellent center of
learning not just to take tests and get good grades but to be in service to others. Many of those lessons are learned through the shared experience on the field. Even the students who participate as spectators gain a strong feeling of community by supporting their friends and fellow classmates.

Please vote YES! to the lights at St. Ignatius Field and thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Pia Jondonovan
1670 21st. Ave. San Francisco
jondonovanpi@seattleu.edu
Commission Affairs  
San Francisco Planning Department  
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400 San Francisco, CA 94103  
Direct: 415.575.9111 | www.sfplanning.org  
San Francisco Property Information Map

REDUCED CAPACITY DURING THE SHELTER IN PLACE ORDER -- The Planning Department is open for business. Most of our staff are working from home and we’re available by e-mail. Our Public Portal, where you can file new applications, and our award-winning Property Information Map are available 24/7. Similarly, the Board of Appeals and Board of Supervisors are accepting appeals via e-mail despite office closures. To protect everyone’s health, all of our in-person services at 1650 and 1660 Mission Street are suspended, and the Planning and Historic Preservation Commissions are cancelled until April 9, at the earliest. Click here for more information.
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Subject: Lights at St. Ignatius Field
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June 1, 2020

President Joe Koppel
and Honorable Commissioners
San Francisco Planning Commission
San Francisco City Hall

Dear Commissioners:

My name is Tom McGuigan and I was born and raised in the Sunset and also attended St. Ignatius, class of 1986. I’m writing in strong support for approval of lights at St. Ignatius Field in order to create more options for student athletes and also to allow St. Ignatius to implement a later start time in accordance to CA State law.

There are fewer spaces for students to practice field sports in San Francisco and allowing S.I. to build these lights will keep students closer to the campus rather than traveling great distances to practice. There are also several students who participate as spectators gain a strong feeling of community by supporting their friends and fellow classmates.

St. Ignatius College Preparatory has been an excellent center of learning not just to take tests and get good grades but to be in service to others. Many of those lessons are learned through the shared experience on the field. Even the students who participate as spectators gain a strong feeling of community by supporting their friends and fellow classmates.

President Joe Koppel and Honorable Commissioners:

Dear Commissioners:

Tom McGuigan
Please vote YES! to the lights at St. Ignatius Field and thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Tom McGuigan
1200 -E2=80=93 39 Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94122
Commission Affairs  
San Francisco Planning Department  
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400 San Francisco, CA 94103  
Direct: 415.575.9111 | www.sfplanning.org  
San Francisco Property Information Map

REDUCED CAPACITY DURING THE SHELTER IN PLACE ORDER -- The Planning Department is open for business. Most of our staff are working from home and we’re available by e-mail. Our Public Portal, where you can file new applications, and our award-winning Property Information Map are available 24/7. Similarly, the Board of Appeals and Board of Supervisors are accepting appeals via e-mail despite office closures. To protect everyone’s health, all of our in-person services at 1650 and 1660 Mission Street are suspended, and the Planning and Historic Preservation Commissions are cancelled until April 9, at the earliest. Click here for more information.

From: INGE HORTON <ingehor@pacbell.net>  
Sent: Monday, June 01, 2020 1:51 PM  
To: CPC-Commissions Secretary <commissions.secretary@sfgov.org>  
Cc: Weissglass, David (CPC) <david.weissglass@sfgov.org>  
Subject: Proposed Additional Development at 4326-4336 Irving Street

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

Planning Commissioners,

I am writing to express my opposition to the proposed additional development at 4326-4336 Irving Street. The existing 12 units are proposed to be changed from 20 bedrooms to 36 bedrooms with the loss of common areas and also all parking spaces. While it might be considered a gain in residential space it actually will result in the loss of affordable units and replacement with rather small and almost substandard rooms without common space i.e. living/dining room. The new units on the 4th floor will result in the reduction of light and air of the surrounding properties. These vertical additions will not fit the neighborhood character and stick out like a sore thumb.

Another major concern is the absence of parking spaces in this new configuration of residences. Although not every occupant of the 36 bedrooms will have a car - and some might even have two occupants with cars - and need parking spaces, the demand for parking exceeds by far what is available on the neighborhood streets and will negatively impact the neighborhood residents and weekend visitors to Ocean Beach and Golden Gate Park and the soccer fields.
This project has more discrepancies with the Planning Code and Residential Design Guidelines and thus I urge you not to approve it.

Sincerely,
Inge Horton
resident of the Outer Sunset
This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

June 1, 2020

President Joel Koppel

and Honorable Commissioners

San Francisco Planning Commission

San Francisco City Hall

Re: Lights at St. Ignatius Field
Dear Commissioners:

I am Albert Lam and I been part of this community for over 30 years. I am proud that my son attended Saint Ignatius and be part of this great academic institution.

I'm writing in strong support for approval for lights at St. Ignatius Field in order to create more options for later school start time as required by new CA State Law signed by Governor Newsom.

Research studies by the American Academy of Pediatrics have confirmed starting school later in the morning leads to better overall health and school performance. This will be the new normal for most California schools.

Another key benefit of the field lights will be allowing kids a safe option to participate in community building Friday night athletic games. These will be on the campus with supervision by faculty, parents and school security to make sure the kids are in a safe and organized event.

Even the students who participate as spectators gain a strong feeling of community by supporting their friends and fellow classmates.

Please vote YES! to the lights at St. Ignatius Field and thank you for your consideration.

Regards

Albert Lam

415-250-1920

AlbertLam@yahoo.com
From: 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: Ocean Avenue CBD <info.oacbd@gmail.com>
Date: Monday, June 1, 2020 at 3:58 PM
To: "keith@saverlyhealthcarearchitects.com" <keith@saverlyhealthcarearchitects.com>
Cc: "Yee, Norman (BOS)" <norman.yee.bos@sfgov.org>, "Low, Jen (BOS)"
<jen.low@sfgov.org>, "Hillis, Rich (CPC)" <rich.hillis@sfgov.org>, "Ionin, Jonas (CPC)"
<jonas.ionin@sfgov.org>, "Horn, Jeffrey (CPC)" <jeffrey.horn@sfgov.org>,
"joel.koppel@sfgov.org" <joel.koppel@sfgov.org>, "Moore, Kathrin (CPC)"
<kathrin.moore@sfgov.org>, "Diamond, Susan (CPC)" <sue.diamond@sfgov.org>, "Fung, Frank
(CPC)" <frank.fung@sfgov.org>, Theresa Imperial <theresa.imperial@sfgov.org>, "Johnson,
Milicent (CPC)" <milicent.johnson@sfgov.org>
Subject: Conditional Use Permit for 1760 Ocean Ave., San Francisco, CA

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

Please see the attached letter for this Planning Commission pending hearing.
Daniel Weaver
Executive Director
Ocean Avenue Association
t: 650-273-6223
e: info.oacbd@gmail.com
Commissioners,

Staff is ready to send hard copies out for your review. Previously, only Commissioner Moore and Diamond confirmed for hard copies of large projects.

Please confirm if anyone else would like to receive a hard copy at home address.

Thank you,
Chanbory Son, Executive Secretary
Commission Affairs
San Francisco Planning Department
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400 San Francisco, CA 94103
Direct: 415.575.6926 | www.sfplanning.org
San Francisco Property Information Map

The Planning Department is open for business during the Stay Safe at Home Order. Most of our staff are working from home and we’re available by e-mail. Our Public Portal, where you can file new applications, and our Property Information Map are available 24/7. The Planning and Historic Preservation Commissions are convening remotely and the public is encouraged to participate. The Board of Appeals, Board of Supervisors, and Planning Commission are accepting appeals via e-mail despite office closures. All of our in-person services at 1650 and 1660 Mission Street are suspended until further notice. Click here for more information.
Good afternoon Commissioners,

It came to my attention (thank you Commissioner Diamond) that the Conditional Use Application attached at the end of the staff report for 2 Geneva (2019-017877CUA) to be heard on the consent calendar this Thursday was inaccurate. This error has been amended and attached you can find the correct Conditional Use Application. No other items in the staff report had been amended.

Thank you and let me know if you have any questions.

Best,

David Weissglass, Planner  
Flex Team, Current Planning Division  
San Francisco Planning Department  
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, CA 94103  
Direct: 415.575.9177 | www.sfplanning.org  
San Francisco Property Information Map

The Planning Department is open for business during the Stay Safe at Home Order. Most of our staff are working from home and we’re available by e-mail. Our Public Portal, where you can file new applications, and our Property Information Map are available 24/7. The Planning and Historic Preservation Commissions are convening remotely and the public is encouraged to participate. The Board of Appeals, Board of Supervisors, and Planning Commission are accepting appeals via e-mail despite office closures. All of our in-person services at 1650 and 1660 Mission Street are suspended until further notice. Click here for more information.
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: James Byrne <jbyrne@byrne-law.net>  
Date: Monday, June 1, 2020 at 11:57 AM  
To: "joel.koppel@sfgov.org" <joel.koppel@sfgov.org>, "Moore, Kathrin (CPC)" <kathrin.moore@sfgov.org>, "Diamond, Susan (CPC)" <sue.diamond@sfgov.org>, "Fung, Frank (CPC)" <frank.fung@sfgov.org>, Theresa Imperial <theresa.imperial@sfgov.org>, "Johnson, Milicent (CPC)" <milicent.johnson@sfgov.org>, "Ionin, Jonas (CPC)" <jonas.ionin@sfgov.org>  
Cc: "Mar, Gordon (BOS)" <gordon.mar@sfgov.org>  
Subject: Lights at Saint Ignatius

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

Dear Commissioners,

I am a native of San Francisco. I attended Saint Ignatius (Class of 73). My four children also graduated from Saint Ignatius. I have lived a few blocks from SI for the last 36 years.

I am writing to you to encourage you to vote for the installation of lights at Saint Ignatius Field. Allowing lights will allow practices to go on longer. Students, especially freshmen, will have a greater opportunity to meet their new classmates. This is especially important during these transformative years.

Saint Ignatius has been an integral part of San Francisco since the time of the Gold Rush. Please allow Saint Ignatius to adapt to changing times. Please vote for lights at Saint Ignatius.

Very truly yours
James M Byrne
Hi Planning Commissioners and Historic Preservation Commissioners,

I am writing to you to voice my strong support for streamlining the CEQA process with the 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
Department's Proposed Standard Environmental Requirements. While I am giving my support as an Architect in the city, I am also giving it as a resident, who feels the impact of the housing crisis and, more importantly, has seen a lot of friends and members in the community struggle to find adequate housing and often, ultimately, leave the Bay Area.

While I am a strong proponent of protecting our environment and the general intent of CEQA, I have seen first-hand the misuse of CEQA in slowing and sometimes killing proposed housing development for issues not related to the environment or the quality of the design. Quality housing projects on urban, developed sites that are not seeking any variances or conditional use authorizations should not take a year-plus just to get through the Planning Department’s portion of the Site Permit review, but we are repeatedly seeing this happen and largely due to the CEQA portion of their review. This is significantly affecting the housing pipeline that is so desperately needed.

We cannot rely on affordable housing requirements alone. We cannot fix the housing crisis until we address the supply problem and remove some of the unproductive roadblocks in the way. Smaller projects seem to be most affected by these roadblocks. Right now housing development only pencils out for Big Developers with deep pockets. Some of our clients are doing fine. But we have other clients that have had to completely abandon projects because lengthy CEQA review and NIMBY opposition has caused them to drain their finances before the project can even break ground.

**Board of Supervisors**, specifically **Supervisor Preston**,

I live in your District. I have met you and voted for you before; this vote is important to maintain my support. I hope when this policy makes it to the Board of Supervisors for a vote that you will vote in favor of it.

Thank you all for your consideration. If you have time, I would be happy to hear your thoughts.

Justin Mikecz
Inner Sunset Resident & Architect
Commission Affairs
San Francisco Planning Department
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400 San Francisco, CA 94103
Direct: 415.575.9111 | www.sfplanning.org
San Francisco Property Information Map

REDUCED CAPACITY DURING THE SHELTER IN PLACE ORDER -- The Planning Department is open for business. Most of our staff are working from home and we're available by e-mail. Our Public Portal, where you can file new applications, and our award-winning Property Information Map are available 24/7. Similarly, the Board of Appeals and Board of Supervisors are accepting appeals via e-mail despite office closures. To protect everyone’s health, all of our in-person services at 1650 and 1660 Mission Street are suspended, and the Planning and Historic Preservation Commissions are cancelled until April 9, at the earliest. Click here for more information.

From: Kristy Wang <kwang@spur.org>
Sent: Thursday, May 28, 2020 12:22 PM
To: Koppel, Joel (CPC) <joel.koppel@sfgov.org>; Imperial, Theresa (CPC) <theresa.imperial@sfgov.org>; Johnson, Milicent (CPC) <milicent.johnson@sfgov.org>; Moore, Kathrin (CPC) <kathrin.moore@sfgov.org>; Fung, Frank (CPC) <frank.fung@sfgov.org>; Diamond, Susan (CPC) <sue.diamond@sfgov.org>
Cc: CPC-Commissions Secretary <commissions.secretary@sfgov.org>; Peskin, Aaron (BOS) <aaron.peskin@sfgov.org>; Hepner, Lee (BOS) <lee.hepner@sfgov.org>; Angulo, Sunny (BOS) <sunny.angulo@sfgov.org>; Sanchez, Diego (CPC) <diego.sanchez@sfgov.org>; Starr, Aaron (CPC) <aaron.starr@sfgov.org>; Hillis, Rich (CPC) <rich.hillis@sfgov.org>; ajohn-baptiste <ajohn-baptiste@spur.org>; Nick Josefowitz <njosefowitz@spur.org>
Subject: SPUR Supports Streamlining Process and Reducing Fees for Community Businesses

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

Re: Conditional Use Review and Approval Process, 2020-003041PCA [Board File No. 200214]

Dear Planning Commissioners,

I hope you, your families and friends are all staying safe and healthy (mentally too).

I am writing to share SPUR's support for Supervisor Peskin's legislation (with Planning staff's
recommended modifications) to streamline the approvals and permitting processes and reduce fees for small and mid-sized businesses. This was a smart and important effort before the pandemic – and it is all the more critical today that the city provide supports to businesses seeking to start up and remain viable in our retail corridors across the city.

Our neighborhood commercial districts play many important roles in the community, serving as places for human connection and community identity as well as mini-economic and jobs centers. SPUR is currently undertaking an effort to (a) look at how cities might support the survival of existing businesses, (b) suggest planning and zoning reforms that will help new or growing businesses occupy vacant storefronts and (c) think more broadly about the role and future of our neighborhood commercial areas. This legislation is the kind of effort that we will be seeking to expand upon in the coming months, and we appreciate Supervisor Peskin and his colleagues' effort to remove hurdles for small businesses.

Thank you for your consideration. Please do not hesitate to contact me with any questions.

Best,
Kristy Wang

--
Kristy Wang, LEED AP
Community Planning Policy Director
SPUR • Ideas + Action for a Better City
(415) 644-4884
(415) 425-8460 m
kwang@spur.org

SPUR | Facebook | Twitter | Join | Get Newsletters
Greetings Planning Commission Members,

I'm writing to you today regarding the Planning Commission hearing for Whole Foods to obtain their Conditional Use Permit.

Please note that as a neighbor who has lived one block from the City Center complex for over 40 years, I have seen several stores come and go in the proposed location beginning with the original Sears Roebuck store. I feel that a Whole Foods grocery store would be a very welcome addition that would have longevity.

We need a grocery store in this neighborhood that is within walking distance for those of us who either don't have a car or don't drive. While Target has a grocery section, it...
offers a limited supply of items and certainly not the healthy, fresh and organic food choices of Whole Foods.

I’ve understood that there is some opposition to the Whole Foods proposal by a union that wants only union workers in the store. As we have been experiencing the past several months, grocery stores and grocery store employees are essential workers, especially during a pandemic or crisis situation.

Although perhaps well-meaning for its union members, I do not believe it would be fair to any of us if it was required for Whole Foods to have only union workers with limiting rules and regulations for both the store and employees. It is certainly not a reason to delay the construction of a store that would be a great service not only to the AnzaVista neighborhood, but also to the greater San Francisco community.

While I heartily support the addition of Whole Foods to City Centre, I am somewhat concerned about potential increased traffic issues. For several years, we have had an ongoing wrong-way driver issue from cars coming out of parking lots onto O'Farrell which is a one-way street. I do not believe the City of San Francisco nor the City Center management has done enough to solve this dangerous issue. This is an issue that needs to be seriously addressed.

Once again, I want to reiterate my support of issuing a Conditional Use Permit to Whole Foods.

Sincerely,

Gina Snow
Vega Street
San Francisco, CA 94115
Commission Affairs  
San Francisco Planning Department  
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400 San Francisco, CA 94103  
Direct: 415.575.9111 | www.sfplanning.org  
San Francisco Property Information Map

REDUCED CAPACITY DURING THE SHELTER IN PLACE ORDER -- The Planning Department is open for business. Most of our staff are working from home and we’re available by e-mail. Our Public Portal, where you can file new applications, and our award-winning Property Information Map are available 24/7. Similarly, the Board of Appeals and Board of Supervisors are accepting appeals via e-mail despite office closures. To protect everyone’s health, all of our in-person services at 1650 and 1660 Mission Street are suspended, and the Planning and Historic Preservation Commissions are cancelled until April 9, at the earliest. Click here for more information.

From: Rrongrong Zheng <rongrong.zheng.usa@gmail.com>  
Sent: Thursday, May 28, 2020 12:47 PM  
To: CPC-Commissions Secretary <commissions.secretary@sfgov.org>  
Subject: Fwd: Record Number: 2018-015239DRP

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

Dear Mr. or Mrs.,

There's a typo on the letter that I sent to you on May 25. Please discard that one and use the attachment attached today.

Thank You!
Rong Rong Zheng

------- Forwarded message -------
From: Rrongrong Zheng <rongrong.zheng.usa@gmail.com>  
Date: Mon, May 25, 2020 at 8:19 PM  
Subject: Record Number: 2018-015239DRP  
To: commissions.secretary@sfgov.org <commissions.secretary@sfgov.org>
Dear Mr. or Mrs,

This is Rong Rong Zheng, 80 years old, I am the owner of 1218 Funston Ave. Attached is a letter from my husband, Zheming Feng, 89 years old, also owner of 1218 Funston Ave. In this letter, we explained why we object to the project on 1222 Funston Ave.

Thank you!
Rong Rong Zheng
Dear Commissioner:

My name is Ashley. I am part of the 2020 graduating class of St. Ignatius' College Preparatory and I have lived in the city my entire life. I’m writing in support of approval for lights at St. Ignatius Field in order to create more options for later school start time as required by new CA State Law signed by Governor Newsom. Research studies by the American Academy of Pediatrics have confirmed starting school later in the morning leads to better overall health and school performance. This will be the new normal for most California schools. Another key benefit of the field lights will be allowing kids a safe option to participate in community building Friday night athletic games. These will be on the campus with supervision by faculty,
parents and school security to make sure the kids are in a safe and organized event. Even the students who participate as spectators gain a strong feeling of community by supporting their friends and fellow classmates.

Please vote YES! to the lights at St. Ignatius Field and thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,
Ashley
atam20@siprep.org
Dear Commissioners:

FYI.

It is good that the Ordinance introduced by Supervisor Mandelman was passed by the Commission and ultimately the Board.

Please consider my comments today regarding adjusting the Demo Calcs per Code Section 317 (b) (2) (D) even as the Staff is apparently reworking Section 317.
Thank you.
And stay well and happy and safe.
Sincerely,
Georgia Schuttish
Hello,

Attached is the PDF version of the letter. Please let me know if there are any issues.

Thank you,

REUBEN, JUNIUS & ROSE, LLP
From: Jennica Dandan  
Sent: Thursday, May 28, 2020 1:29 PM  
To: Joel Koppel (joel.koppel@sfgov.org) <joel.koppel@sfgov.org>; Kathrin Moore <kathrin.moore@sfgov.org>; sue.diamond@sfgov.org; frank.fung@sfgov.org; Milicent A. Johnson <milicent.johnson@sfgov.org>; theresa.imperial@sfgov.org; Corey A. Teague <corey.teague@sfgov.org>  
Cc: david.winslow@sfgov.org; Jody Knight <jknight@reubenlaw.com>; Gordon-Jonckheer, Elizabeth (CPC) <elizabeth.gordon-jonckheer@sfgov.org>; Ajello, Laura (CPC) <laura.ajello@sfgov.org>; commissions.secretary@sfgov.org  
Subject: 440-448 Waller Street - Project Sponsor Brief Letter (Planning Case No. 2018-000528DRP)

Hello,

Per Jody Knight’s request, please use this link to view/download the Project Sponsor’s brief letter related to 440-448 Waller Street (Planning Case No. 2018-000528DRP): https://reubenlaw.sharefile.com/d-s0e2568d6c7f4424a

Please let me know if you have any issues with the link.

Thank you,

REUBEN, JUNIUS & ROSE, LLP

Jennica Dandan  
Legal Assistant  
T. (415) 567-9000  
F. (415) 399-9480  
jdandan@reubenlaw.com  
www.reubenlaw.com

SF Office: One Bush Street, Suite 600  
San Francisco, CA 94104  
Oakland Office: 456 8th Street, 2nd Floor  
Oakland, CA 94607
Dear Planning Commission,

Please see the attached petition in support of the 1100 units of housing proposed at Balboa Reservoir.

Best,
Laura

Laura Foote
Executive Director | Pronouns: she/her
This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

I understand this project will be considered by the Planning Commission today. I oppose the large-scale massing along the western edge of the project.

I am a resident of Westwood Park, with my 100 year old home on the western edge of the proposed massive housing project. This neighborhood is filled with historic architecturally-protected houses and working class families. We have invested here, living with height and massing restrictions applicable these homes. We can't even replace failing windows without making sure that the replacements meet architectural standards.

I support the City's goal of adding housing, and I could even be OK with development in the reservoir. But the massive buildings on the west side of the project are out of scale with the character of the neighborhood.

In addition, in developing the area master plan, we had been promised no more than 500 or so units. The neighbors continue to feel duped by our politicians with the number of proposed units.
With the proposed 2-7 story buildings, it's the equivalent of constructing several multi-story Costcos next to 1,200 ft craftsman homes.

The developer, Avalon team, have welcomed my concerns and seem to be working hard to listen to the community concerns. But their design proposals are limited by the City’s demand for more than 1,000 units, a random number that is contrary to the promises we’ve heard before.

It's time for the City's politicians to consider the interests of all San Franciscans.

Adrienne Go
Plymouth Ave
Hi. Sorry this is a bit late and more hastily prepared than usual, but I hope will still be considered.

Thank you all for all your hard work and I hope you are all well.

Sincerely,
Christine Weibel
To San Francisco Planning Commission:

Please certify the EIR, adopt the Design Standards and Guidelines, and forward your approval to the Board of Supervisors of the Planning Code amendments, Zoning Map amendments, and Development Agreement of the Balboa Reservoir housing development.

I have been attending the CAC meetings since 2015. Mayor Ed Lee identified the Balboa Reservoir for housing when he launched the Public Land for Housing program in response to the housing affordability crisis in 2014. Supervisor Norman Yee established the CAC in 2015. I have been attending ever since because I think that more housing is desperately needed in order to make San Francisco more affordable and accessible to live in.
**The EIR is satisfactory**
As far as the natural environment is concerned, the Balboa Reservoir is probably one of the least impactful places to put housing. there’s no nature there now that would be displaced, there’s no hazardous soil, and there are no parks that would be shadowed.

The only significant environmental impacts are increased traffic and transit delays (assuming that Muni does not increase service in response to increased demand).

I don’t think neighbors are 100% satisfied with the EIR, but I think it dots all the legal Ts.

**Please adopt the Design Standards**
The design standards call for superior design and materials, as neighbors expect.

I wish the allowed heights were higher. Ironically, if you look in the example townhouses in the Design Standards document, every single photo of a townhouse is 3 stories tall, yet the design standards limit the townhouses on the west side to only 2 stories tall (25 ft height limit, which is lower than the 28 ft limit of Westwood Park). And on the rest of the project, heights should be limited by financial feasibility rather than capped based on purely aesthetic reasons.

**Please forward the Development Agreement and Planning Code Amendments with a positive recommendation**
Please move the Development Agreement forward. The residents of the city need as much housing as possible, as quickly as possible.

Here’s what I don’t like about the DA:

Exhibit J: I wish that some of the parking spots were set aside for CCSF students and staff based on need rather than simply “market-rate”

I wish that the ~$11.2 million Purchase and Sale Agreement (PSA) (Recital H) were a 30 to 60-year lease instead. As long as Proposition 13 exists, I don’t think it’s responsible for the city to divest of urban land. The last decade has shown that low property taxes and low interest rates magnify purchase prices, so that changes in rent result in huge private windfalls when rents increase (or huge private losses when rents fall). Besides, a land lease may be beneficial to the development by reducing developer risk and reducing the amount of debt that the developer must issue.

I’m disappointed that the Development Agreement includes city subsidies for 33.3% of the low and moderate income units (or equivalent to subsidizing almost all the low income units), or up to $43.8 million of city affordable housing funds. This contradicts MOHCD’s original position from before the RFP, which was that the project would be entirely funded by the market-rate units in the project. I think there are a few ways that the SFPUC’s “fair market value compensation” policy (PUC Resolution 12-0042) could be satisfied while avoiding such large city subsidies. For example, the deal could be structured as a density bonus, where the SFPUC gets fair market value for the land based on a baseline of market-rate units, and then the project builds more low-income units on top of that.
I think the large subsidy that is needed for income-restricted housing is due to the significant non-housing amenities that we demanded as construction costs that have been rising continuously for the duration of the process. Had we started construction sooner, we likely would not have needed subsidy from MOHCD.

Correction: Exhibit D: The definition of “Low-Income Units” is sloppy and incorrect. It says, “will have rents set between 30% to 80% of AMI, with an average rental rate per building of no more than 60% of AMI, or an average purchase price of no more than 80% of AMI.” It should instead be 1) restricted to occupancy by low-income households of a certain income range, 2) priced/rented at an amount that a person in that income range can afford. This definition sets the “rental rate” at $6404/month (MOHCD’s 2020 4-person AMI), when it should be setting the income limit at $6404/month.

Despite these flaws, the project is a net project to the city so please approve of it.

**Conclusion**

Please move this project forward. It’s been 5 years, the handful of neighbors have rehashed all the arguments as much as we could, and the city still needs the housing. It’s better late than never.

Yonathan
Hello,

Attached is my public comment support letter in favor of the Balboa Reservoir development project for the Planning Commission meeting on Thursday, May 28, 2020.

I ask that it please be entered into the record for the meeting in lieu of an in-person appearance in accordance with our local shelter in place ordinance.

Many thanks,

Marcus A. Ismael
Mobile phone: 1.
415.312.0706
LinkedIn
Commission Affairs
San Francisco Planning Department
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400 San Francisco, CA 94103
Direct: 415.575.9111 | www.sfplanning.org
San Francisco Property Information Map

REDUCED CAPACITY DURING THE SHELTER IN PLACE ORDER -- The Planning Department is open for business. Most of our staff are working from home and we’re available by e-mail. Our Public Portal, where you can file new applications, and our award-winning Property Information Map are available 24/7. Similarly, the Board of Appeals and Board of Supervisors are accepting appeals via e-mail despite office closures. To protect everyone’s health, all of our in-person services at 1650 and 1660 Mission Street are suspended, and the Planning and Historic Preservation Commissions are cancelled until April 9, at the earliest. Click here for more information.

From: SF MAP <info@missionawarenessproject.com>
Sent: Thursday, May 28, 2020 5:10 PM
To: CPC-Commissions Secretary <commissions.secretary@sfgov.org>
Cc: Winslow, David (CPC) <david.winslow@sfgov.org>
Subject: 3591 20th Street : 2020-000909DRP

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

Please see attached letter for the Commissioners regarding 2020-000909DRP.
Commission Affairs
San Francisco Planning Department
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400 San Francisco, CA 94103
Direct: 415.575.9111 | www.sfplanning.org
San Francisco Property Information Map

REDUCED CAPACITY DURING THE SHELTER IN PLACE ORDER -- The Planning Department is open for business. Most of our staff are working from home and we're available by e-mail. Our Public Portal, where you can file new applications, and our award-winning Property Information Map are available 24/7. Similarly, the Board of Appeals and Board of Supervisors are accepting appeals via e-mail despite office closures. To protect everyone's health, all of our in-person services at 1650 and 1660 Mission Street are suspended, and the Planning and Historic Preservation Commissions are cancelled until April 9, at the earliest. Click here for more information.

From: SF MAP <info@missionawarenessproject.com>
Sent: Thursday, May 28, 2020 5:39 PM
To: CPC-Commissions Secretary <commissions.secretary@sfgov.org>
Cc: Winslow, David (CPC) <david.winslow@sfgov.org>
Subject: 178 Seacliff Avenue : 2017-013959DRP

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

Please see attached letter for the Commissioners.
REDUCED CAPACITY DURING THE SHELTER IN PLACE ORDER -- The Planning Department is open for business. Most of our staff are working from home and we’re available by e-mail. Our Public Portal, where you can file new applications, and our award-winning Property Information Map are available 24/7. Similarly, the Board of Appeals and Board of Supervisors are accepting appeals via e-mail despite office closures. To protect everyone’s health, all of our in-person services at 1650 and 1660 Mission Street are suspended, and the Planning and Historic Preservation Commissions are cancelled until April 9, at the earliest. Click here for more information.

From: andyoum@hotmail.com <andyoum@hotmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, May 28, 2020 6:17 PM
To: Koppel, Joel (CPC) <joel.koppel@sfgov.org>; Moore, Kathrin (CPC) <kathrin.moore@sfgov.org>; Diamond, Susan (CPC) <sue.diamond@sfgov.org>; Fung, Frank (CPC) <frank.fung@sfgov.org>; Johnson, Milicent (CPC) <milicent.johnson@sfgov.org>; Ionin, Jonas (CPC) <jonas.ionin@sfgov.org>;
CPC-Commissions Secretary <commissions.secretary@sfgov.org>
Cc: Mar, Gordon (BOS) <gordon.mar@sfgov.org>
Subject: Planning Commissioners

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

May 28, 2020

President Joel Koppel
and Honorable Commissioners
San Francisco Planning Commission
San Francisco City Hall

VIA EMAIL
Re: Lights at St. Ignatius Field

Dear Commissioners:

My name is Andy Oum, and I am the father of two students at Saint Ignatius. I have live in the Sunset District for over 15 years and love our inclusive neighborhood. SI has provided a very safe place for our kids to exert their stored energy in the fields and we need it to be open for them from time to time at extended hours.

I’m writing in strong support for approval of lights at St. Ignatius Field in order to create more options for student athletes and also to allow St. Ignatius to implement a later start time in accordance to CA State law.

There are fewer spaces for students to practice field sports in San Francisco and allowing S.I. to build these lights will keep students closer to the campus rather than traveling great distances to practice.

St. Ignatius College Preparatory has been an excellent center of learning not just to take tests and get good grades but to be in service to others. Many of those lessons are learned through the shared experience on the field. Even the students who participate as spectators gain a strong feeling of community by supporting their friends and fellow classmates.

Please vote YES! to the lights at St. Ignatius Field and thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Andy Oum
2479 37th Ave
SF CA 94116

Andyoum@hotmail.com

Sent from myMail for iOS
Dear Planning Commission,

I dialed into the call this evening, but missed the opportunity to provide a verbal comment. I hope you will be able to add my written comment to the dossier.

I live in the Anza Vista neighborhood and I oppose granting a Conditional Use Permit to Whole Foods:

1. We already have several groceries stores within a short distance
Whole Foods Hearing

The Whole Foods hearing before the Planning Commission to obtain their Conditional Use Permit to become the key tenant in the City Center Mall will be held sometime in the late afternoon/early evening this Thursday, May 28th. This will be a video rather than an in-person hearing so participating should be much easier this year.

I’ve been informed by the Mall that there will be some serious opposition to Whole Foods’ proposal by at least one union so getting their Conditional Use Permit will be no slam dunk and, if we want them as a tenant, we’ve got to work for it. If you agree that Whole Foods is a good fit for our neighborhood then you can voice your support by either sending an email to the Planning Commission or by calling in on the Public Comment call-in line during the hearing or both.

The Mall feels that calling in gives us the biggest bang for our buck. The toll free call in number is:

888-273-3658 and the access code is 310452

We’re not sure exactly when the meeting will start but the Mall said that they will let us know in the afternoon when they are about to be heard so we don’t need to be on hold on a phone waiting to talk any longer than necessary. I will be sending out a subsequent email informing you of the anticipated start time.

Each caller will be given two minutes to make their points so, if you do call in, you don’t need to make a big speech; just hit a few key points about why Whole Foods is a good fit for our area. For example, we need a grocery store in our area that is walkable especially for our seniors who may not be able to drive, if you can drive there will be 117 parking spaces, other lots in neighboring areas are often full and almost impossible to get into such as Trader Joe’s parking lot, Whole Foods is a perfect fit for the particular space in the Mall and will create approximately 200 new permanent jobs, etc., plus add your own personal reasons for why you feel we need them. I’ve attached a Project Sponsor Letter which may also give you a few more ideas.

Call in instructions can be found at https://sfplanning.org/remotehearings. They are a little detailed so please familiarize yourself with them prior to calling in.

If you prefer to send an email, address it to all of the following:

commissions.secretary@sfgov.org
jonas.ionin@sfgov.org
joel.koppel@sfgov.org
kathrin.moore@sfgov.org
milicent.johnson@sfgov.org
Please be sure your email arrives no later than the morning of the 28th.

You should be able to view the live meeting on the SFgovTV website (https://sfgovtv.org/planning) or watch it on Channel 78.

Please give me a call if you have any questions.

Thanks,

Al Sodini

415 931-8988
Commission Affairs
San Francisco Planning Department
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400 San Francisco, CA 94103
Direct: 415.575.9111 | www.sfplanning.org
San Francisco Property Information Map

REduced CAPACITY DURING THE SHELTER IN PLACE ORDER -- The Planning Department is open for business. Most of our staff are working from home and we’re available by e-mail. Our Public Portal, where you can file new applications, and our award-winning Property Information Map are available 24/7. Similarly, the Board of Appeals and Board of Supervisors are accepting appeals via e-mail despite office closures. To protect everyone’s health, all of our in-person services at 1650 and 1660 Mission Street are suspended, and the Planning and Historic Preservation Commissions are cancelled until April 9, at the earliest. Click here for more information.

From: Mr. Michael Shaughnessy <mshaughnessy@siprep.org>
Sent: Friday, May 29, 2020 9:07 AM
To: oel.koppel@sfgov.org; Moore, Kathrin (CPC) <kathrin.moore@sfgov.org>; Diamond, Susan (CPC) <sue.diamond@sfgov.org>; Fung, Frank (CPC) <frank.fung@sfgov.org>; Imperial, Theresa (CPC) <theresa.imperial@sfgov.org>; Johnson, Milicent (CPC) <milicent.johnson@sfgov.org>; Ionin, Jonas (CPC) <jonas.ionin@sfgov.org>; CPC-Commissions Secretary <commissions.secretary@sfgov.org>
Cc: Mar, Gordon (BOS) <gordon.mar@sfgov.org>
Subject: Lights at Saint Ignatius Field

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

May 29, 2020

President Joel Koppel and Honorable Commissioners
San Francisco Planning Commission
San Francisco City Hall
VIA EMAIL

Dear Commissioners:

I’m writing in strong support for approval of lights at St. Ignatius Field in order to create more
options for student athletes and also to allow St. Ignatius to implement a later start time in accordance to CA State law.

I am a life-long Sunset resident and retired last year after teaching for 40 years at Saint Ignatius. My three adult children played sports for AP Giannini and Saint Ignatius. I watched the Jim Lucey soccer fields being constructed from my classroom window and used to watch baseball, softball, soccer and lacrosse games at West Sunset when SI could still use City fields. I coached Viking soccer teams that practiced and played at West Sunset, including the lighted softball fields during the evenings with early sunsets.

I remember when the City refused to allow the soccer fields to be lighted after the neighbors objected. I'm not sure how many of you remember that part of the cause of the objection was in response to the City's granting permission for adult league games on weekends while not arranging for the restroom facilities to be opened.

Saint Ignatius is a good neighbor and works diligently to provide recreational opportunities to hundreds of student athletes, currently arranging transportation for hundreds of athletes to Pacifica for practice and competition. At Saint Ignatius, athletics are considered co-curricular, not extra-curricular. Lessons of commitment, discipline, service and community are learned on athletic fields as much as in classrooms.

Please vote YES!

Thank you for your consideration.
Sincerely,
Michael
--
Religious Studies - retired
St. Ignatius College Preparatory
2001 37th Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94116
mshaughnessy@siprep.org

1374 La Playa Street
San Francisco, CA, 94122
Dear Commissioners:

My Name is Humana and I have lived in the West Sunset for 10 plus years. Although I am not an alumni of Saint Ignatius, I feel as if these lights will be beneficial in a multitude of ways. I’m writing in strong support for approval of lights at St. Ignatius Field in order to create more options for student athletes and also to allow St. Ignatius to implement a later start time in accordance to CA State law. There are fewer spaces for students to practice field sports in San Francisco and allowing S.I. to build these lights will keep students closer to the campus rather than traveling great distances to practice. St. Ignatius College Preparatory has been an excellent center of learning not just to take tests and get good grades but to be in service to others. Many of those lessons are learned through the shared experience on the field. Even the students who participate as spectators gain a
strong feeling of community by supporting their friends and fellow classmates. Please vote YES! to the lights at St. Ignatius Field and thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Humana Hasana
Respected SF Planning Commissioners:

I write in support of the UCSF Comprehensive Parnassus Heights Plan. The plan has been developed in an open and transparent process, with the engagement of many of my neighbors. The scope of the plan is admirably large and ambitious, and will improve the immediate neighborhood by:

1. increasing public access to the campus,
2. enhancing the design of the campus entrances and boundaries,
3. updating the University buildings and open spaces.

I believe that the resulting improvements will also help the University do its work, and remain a leader in the advancement of health in the region and in the world. I am sure that this outcome is supported by an overwhelming majority of our fellow San Franciscans. The University needs our support to enable its goals.
I am favorably impressed by the high quality of the design consultants and planners that the University has engaged, and the encouragement these consultants have received from the University to pursue excellent solutions.

I hope you will support the UCSF CPHP, and, through your leadership, enable and encourage this ambitious re-imagining.

Sincerely,

Kevin Hart

KEVIN HART ARCHITECTURE
1248 5th Avenue
San Francisco California 94122
415.244.3010
www.hart-architecture.com
Dear Commissioners:

My name is Nicole Trierweiler, and I was born and raised in the Sunset/Parkside neighborhoods of San Francisco. I graduated from SI in 2011 and still currently live in Outer Parkside.

I’m writing in strong support for approval of lights at St. Ignatius Field in order to create more options for student athletes and also to allow St. Ignatius to implement
a later start time in accordance to CA State law.

Sports were an integral part of my education at SI, enriching my social experience and teaching me the crucial time management skills that eased my transition into college and carried over into my professional life. I urge you to consider the many ways in which participation in athletics benefits students and academic institutions, and the importance of having a safe space on campus for students to participate in these activities.

There are fewer spaces for students to practice field sports in San Francisco and allowing SI to build these lights will keep students closer to the campus rather than traveling great distances to practice.

Please vote YES! to the lights at St. Ignatius Field and thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Nicole Trierweiler
2666 40th Avenue
ntrier93@gmail.com
To the Members of the San Francisco Planning Commission,

I was very disappointed to learn that Whole Foods was not approved as a tenant for the City Center Mall at yesterday’s meeting and that the issue was deferred to the June meeting. I am writing to wholeheartedly support their tenancy. We have lived in this neighborhood for over 30 years, having purchased our home when the City Center Mall was a Sears store. While we still miss the convenience of having the Sears within an easy walk, having the Whole Foods would be a great asset for the neighborhood. Thank you.

--Dora Mao
45 Anzavista Avenue
Dear Commissioners,

My name is Chris Angelopoulos. I am born and raised in the Sunset District of San Francisco and attended St. Ignatius Class of '88 and still reside and do business here in the City with my family. My oldest daughter graduated from SI in 2018, and I have a son and daughter still at SI. My son is entering his Senior year of Wildcat Football. I am a strong supporter of the lights at J.B. Murphy field and feel that it would enhance the experience for both the students and parents at SI. SI is a place that teaches its students so much, and many of those lessons are taught through the sport programs that students participate in. Lights will allow for students to not have to travel far for certain games and practices and allows for a better
experience all around. I appreciate your time and ask that you please vote yes for the lights on the Saint Ignatius field.

Thank You,
Chris Angelopoulos
This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

May 29, 2020

President Joel Koppel
and Honorable Commissioners
San Francisco Planning Commission
San Francisco City Hall

Re: Lights at St. Ignatius Field

Dear Commissioners:

[Email content follows here]
My wife and I have lived in the Sunset for 45 years. Our son and daughter are both alumni of St. Ignatius. I’m writing in strong support for approval of lights at St. Ignatius Field in order to create more options for student athletes and also to allow St. Ignatius to implement a later start time in accordance to CA State law.

There are fewer spaces for students to practice field sports in San Francisco and allowing S.I. to build these lights will keep students closer to the campus rather than traveling great distances to practice.

St. Ignatius College Preparatory has been an excellent center of learning not just to take tests and get good grades but to be in service to others. Many of those lessons are learned through the shared experience on the field. Even the students who participate as spectators gain a strong feeling of community by supporting their friends and fellow classmates.

Please vote **YES!** to the lights at St. Ignatius Field and thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Mr. & Mrs. Robert G. Tischer
4020 Ortega Street
San Francisco, CA 94122

bobtisch@aol.com
Hi there,

My name is Ray Yang, and I am a resident at 1300 22nd street, San Francisco. I want to write and register my personal opposition to the building of a cannabis dispensary on 667/669 Mississippi Street. My strong opposition is based on 3 main reasons.

- This will represent the only cannabis retail fronting a completely residential street. It is also surrounded by residential uses on all four sides.
- There is high density multifamily (for example, the Landing, Knox, Sierra, Live Work lofts) and many single family houses. This is not appropriate context for a lounge and dispensary.
- There are already multiple cannabis dispensary within 2 minute drive in any direction.

Thank you very much!

Best,
Ray
Dear Members of the San Francisco Planning Commission,

I'm writing in support of the UCSF Comprehensive Parnassus Heights Plan as a neighbor and a CPHP Committee Member. UCSF has engaged in an open, thorough, and transparent process with committee members, neighbors, and the public. Regarding the committee—of which I have been a part of since September of 2019—it was instrumental in developing the CPHP along with input from neighbors like me, and members of the public. The CPHP is reflective of both the University’s mission and priorities of providing world-class healthcare and medicine now and into the future and the needs and desires of the surrounding community.

As a renter in my mid-20s, I plan to continue to set up roots in the Inner Sunset and Parnassus neighborhood and I see UCSF as an incredible community partner now and in the future. Not
only do they provide employment to hundreds of my neighbors but they also support our local small business community. They have expressed the need to renovate, remodel to be at pace with healthcare needs in the future and as someone who will potentially be in their care it's important that we continue to advance.

Thank you so much for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Caleb J. Krywenko
1225 3rd Avenue
SF, CA 94122
This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

I am very concerned that Westwood park will be ruined by a massive structure planned for the Balboa Reservoir. For over 100 years Westwood Park has kept its promise to be an oasis in the City with homes separated, nothing above 24 feet, and ample parking. The massively high development has none of these characteristics and will overwhelm our neighborhood. It will loom over Plymouth Ave and be the only thing residents see as they look toward what used to be the beautiful science building of City College with it's "The Truth Shall Make You Free". Well the truth is that this is going to blight our beautiful and historic neighborhood.

William Hoskins,
Westwood Park Resident since 1958
Comission Affairs
San Francisco Planning Department
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400 San Francisco, CA 94103
Direct: 415.575.9111 | www.sfplanning.org
San Francisco Property Information Map

REDDUCED CAPACITY DURING THE SHELTER IN PLACE ORDER -- The Planning Department is open for business. Most of our staff are working from home and we’re available by e-mail. Our Public Portal, where you can file new applications, and our award-winning Property Information Map are available 24/7. Similarly, the Board of Appeals and Board of Supervisors are accepting appeals via e-mail despite office closures. To protect everyone’s health, all of our in-person services at 1650 and 1660 Mission Street are suspended, and the Planning and Historic Preservation Commissions are cancelled until April 9, at the earliest. Click here for more information.

-----Original Message-----
From: Christopher Pederson <chpederson@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, June 01, 2020 10:07 AM
To: CPC-Commissions Secretary <commissions.secretary@sfgov.org>
Cc: Switzky, Joshua (CPC) <joshua.switzky@sfgov.org>; Murasaki, Alicia (UCSF) <Alicia.Murasaki@ucsf.edu>; Jones, Sarah (MTA) <Sarah.Jones@sfmta.com>
Subject: UCSF Comprehensive Parnassus Heights Plan (Planning Commission Agenda item no. 11)

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

Dear President Koppel and Commissioners:

UCSF’s draft comprehensive plan for Parnassus Heights is dismayingly deficient about how UCSF plans to minimize automobile commuting. Although the plan discusses in general terms how UCSF hopes to make its buildings more energy efficient, it does not address reducing greenhouse gas emissions from transportation, which is the city’s largest source of greenhouse gas emissions. Instead, the plan talks about “welcoming” all modes of transportation, explicitly including the automobile. It devotes much space to how to manage automobiles once they arrive at campus, but disregards trying to minimize the number of cars driven to campus in the first place.

Please press UCSF to adopt a Transit/Bicycle/Pedestrian First approach to transportation planning. This would include not only working with SFMTA to make transit service through campus more efficient and attractive, but also adopting strategies to affirmatively encourage use of sustainable modes of transportation and discourage use of the automobile. If the second largest employer in San Francisco does not do much more to promote sustainable modes, San Francisco has no hope of achieving its goal of having 80 percent of all trips be by sustainable modes by 2030.

Thank you for your consideration of my comments.

Sincerely,
Dear Anne et al,

Please accept my sincere apologies for not getting back to you sooner on this time-sensitive request. This week has been particularly challenging on various fronts.

I appreciate your continued concern for the Mr. Ibarra and surrounding neighbors, and understand the importance of your request for the survey to be expedited and be a precondition of any further construction work on the site. Given that we were able to extensively cover this and other issues in the negotiations with the project team over the past month, and that we heard their best offer and that they have submitted revised plans to Planning including the changes to windows that have been shared with you, we don't feel that a request for a second continuance will be the most productive step to close the loop on this. Rather, it seems that you all have a very solid case to present to the Commission that the
Planning approval for this project should be conditioned upon a site survey being conducted prior to issuance of the building permit, and for the project to be modified with staff review should the survey reveal any discrepancies between their proposal and the actual lot lines. Based on what the project team has already offered in this regard, and my experience with the Commission I think it would be reasonable to expect the Commission to support that kind of condition on this project during the hearing tomorrow.

I hope this is helpful as you all prepare for tomorrow's hearing. I will be tuning in, and of course we will stand by to assist with any further negotiations with and oversight of the project team that are necessary following tomorrow's outcome.

Thank you all so much for your efforts here, and please don't hesitate to be in touch any time. Stay well, everyone!

Jacob
We’re considering the most recent offer from the project team. It reads:

1) We have committed and will share with Bridget from Planning that the visual marking of the boundary survey is a Condition of Approval from the Planning Commission, so no building permits could be issued without the completion of the visual marking.

2) In the unlikely event that the visual marking shows any encroachment over the joint property line, our plans will be revised to eliminate any encroachment.

3) In the unlikely event that the visual marking shows any debris or construction material that has encroached over the joint property line, such construction material will immediately be removed.

We agree with the project team that a professional line-to-line survey needs to be performed and marked (Item 1) and very much appreciate the project team’s commitment to completing it.

**However, any change required by this survey will revise their plans (Item 2) and thus make their scheduled 5/21/20 presentation to the Planning Commission inaccurate and the plans presented obsolete.**

We believe that a continuance allowing the project team to have a professional surveyor perform the survey before presenting to the Planning Commission is in the best interest of all concerned — the Karamanoses, Carlos Ibarra and surrounding neighbors, the Planning Commission, and the mediators.

**We hope you’ll support us in a request for a second continuance** so that the survey may be performed and included in a complete presentation to the Planning Commission. The project team has committed to performing the survey, and mediation will be better served by performing the survey first.

Attached are pdfs of eight emails sent to the Planning Commission last week expressing neighborhood opposition to the project as it stands, and requesting a line-to-line survey.
Please let us know if you have any questions for us. We know that time is short and look forward to hearing from you soon.

Thank you,

Anne Guaspari 378 Diamond St.
John Guaspari 378 Diamond St.
Kay Klumb 382 Diamond St
Joan Ramo 4101 21st Street
Richard Santucci MD 404 Diamond Street
Christine Santucci 404 Diamond Street
Marc Schroeder 390 Diamond Street
Cynthia Schroeder 390 Diamond Street
Curtis Larsen 385 Eureka Street
Carlos Ibarra 4124 21st Street
From: 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: "Hillis, Rich (CPC)" <rich.hillis@sfgov.org>
Date: Thursday, May 21, 2020 at 6:19 PM
To: Theresa Imperial <theresa.imperial@sfgov.org>, "ffung@ed2intl.com"<ffung@ed2intl.com>, "Moore, Kathrin (CPC)" <kathrin.moore@sfgov.org>, "joel.koppel@sfgov.org" <joel.koppel@sfgov.org>, "Johnson, Milicent (CPC)" <milicent.johnson@sfgov.org>, "Diamond, Susan (CPC)" <sue.diamond@sfgov.org>, "Ionin, Jonas (CPC)" <jonas.ionin@sfgov.org>
Subject: Fw: 30 Van Ness Letter

From: Shaw, Eric (MYR) <eric.shaw@sfgov.org>
Sent: Thursday, May 21, 2020 2:04 PM
To: Hillis, Rich (CPC) <rich.hillis@sfgov.org>; Ely, Lydia (MYR) <lydia.ely@sfgov.org>
Subject: 30 Van Ness Letter

Please see attached

Eric D. Shaw
Director

Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development
City and County of San Francisco
1 South Van Ness Avenue, 5th Floor
From: Amy Swanson <amyswansonperry@gmail.com>
Date: Saturday, May 30, 2020 at 11:15 AM
To: "Ionin, Jonas (CPC)" <jonas.ionin@sfgov.org>
Cc: "Alexander, Christy (CPC)" <christy.alexander@sfgov.org>, "Preston, Dean (BOS)" <dean.preston@sfgov.org>, "christopher.perry@bain.com" <christopher.perry@bain.com>
Subject: I Support the 98 Franklin Project

Dear Commission President Koppel and Planning Commissioners,

I am contacting you to express my families support for the proposed 98 Franklin Street development. My name is Amy Swanson-Perry. My husband Chris Perry and I are San Francisco residents and the parents of George and Charlotte Perry who have been a member of the French American and International High School community for six years.

FAIS is San Francisco's oldest and largest international school. Our community brings together people from many backgrounds. Together we strive to create a shared culture that develops compassionate, confident, and principled people who will make the world better.

98 Franklin is exactly the kind of mixed-use, mixed-income, placemaking, transit-orientated development that will serve San Francisco well into the future. The project will provide at 80+ affordable units which San Francisco desperately needs and London Bree has promised this city.

The project will also help address the Haves Valley neighborhood’s challenges with
vandalism. Increased pedestrian activity – which the additional residents, new retail, and improved streetscape will create – is a natural deterrent to vandalism.

French American International School has a history of working collaboratively with the community. The school has developed several previously dormant properties, added security staff, and helped increase foot traffic in the neighborhood. The new campus is uniquely positioned to establish us in San Francisco’s urban landscape and will be a distinct civic landmark that is representative of our culture, mission, and sense of place.

We strongly encourage your support of French American International School and the 98 Franklin Street development.

Thank you for your consideration.

Best,

Amy + Chris

--

Amy Swanson-Perry
415-203-7664
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: Sonja Trauss <sonja.trauss@gmail.com>
Date: Saturday, May 30, 2020 at 4:06 PM
To: "Board of Supervisors, (BOS)" <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>, "Stefani, Catherine (BOS)" <catherine.stefani@sfgov.org>, "Fewer, Sandra (BOS)" <sandra.fewer@sfgov.org>, "Ionin, Jonas (CPC)" <jonas.ionin@sfgov.org>, "MandelmanStaff, [BOS]" <mandelmanstaff@sfgov.org>, "Mar, Gordon (BOS)" <gordon.mar@sfgov.org>, "Peskin, Aaron (BOS)" <aaron.peskin@sfgov.org>, "Ronen, Hillary" <hillary.ronen@sfgov.org>, "Safai, Ahsha (BOS)" <ahsha.safai@sfgov.org>, "Walton, Shamann (BOS)" <shamann.walton@sfgov.org>, "Yee, Norman (BOS)" <norman.yee@sfgov.org>, "Preston, Dean (BOS)" <dean.preston@sfgov.org>, "Fung, Frank (CPC)" <frank.fung@sfgov.org>, "joel.koppel@sfgov.org" <joel.koppel@sfgov.org>, "Haney, Matt (BOS)" <matt.haney@sfgov.org>, "Johnson, Milicent (CPC)" <milicent.johnson@sfgov.org>, Kathrin Moore <mooreurban@aol.com>, "Diamond, Susan (CPC)" <sue.diamond@sfgov.org>, Theresa Imperial <theresa.imperial@sfgov.org>
Cc: "Merlone, Audrey (CPC)" <audrey.merlone@sfgov.org>, Laura Clark <laura@yimbyaction.org>, Aaron Starr <aaron.starr@sfgov.org>
Subject: SUPPORT Exemption from Density Limits for Affordable and Unauthorized Units 2019-014348PCA [Board File No. 190757]

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

Re:
Exemption from Density Limits for Affordable and Unauthorized Units
2019-014348PCA [Board File No. 190757]
Hi all,

I am writing to support the above captioned legislation, literally legalizing existing housing, and also exempting affordable housing from density limits. I support this legislation because we are in a housing shortage, it will produce new housing and legalize existing housing, and because I agree with the philosophy - we should not have laws that limit affordable housing.

On page 3 of the planning staff report, attached here, planning objects to removing the “cap” of no more than 25% of units in the building being exempt from the density calculation because it makes the required inclusionary calculation "infinitely more complicated."

While infinity does come into it, calculating the sum of a geometric series is actually super simple. Here is the wikipedia page about it: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Geometric_series#Formula

As $n$ goes to infinity, the absolute value of $r$ must be less than one for the series to converge. The sum then becomes

$$a + ar + ar^2 + ar^3 + \cdots = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} ar^k = \frac{a}{1-r}, \text{ for } |r| < 1.$$

Using the formula for the numbers in the staff report example, the total number of units in the project will be

$$200 \times (1 / [1 - 0.2]) = 200 \times (1/0.8) = 200 \times (10/8) = 200 \times (1.25) = 250.$$

200 MR units and 50 BMR units.

Because they don't know how to find the sum of a converging geometric series, the planning staff recommended that the Board "amend Section 207(c) to state that mandatory inclusionary units may not be exempted from the density calculation," basically gutting this part of the legislation.

If Supervisor Mandelman's proposed policy change doesn't pass because planning staff, planning commissioners and the whole Board of Supervisors all didn't notice that we are dealing with a geometric series, and all don't know how to calculate a sum of one, that would be really very embarrassing.

Hopefully this came up in the testimony at the Planning Commission, and my email is redundant.

Best,
Sonja Trauss
215 900 1457

APPENDIX

If you want more explanation of the arithmetic, read here.
The staff report has the following example:

"If the requirement to retain at least 20% of the units as inclusionary is to remain intact, it will require a lengthy and iterative calculation which will only be complete when the project hits its maximum height and bulk limitations. As an example: A project proposes to build 200 units. Under a 20% inclusionary requirement, 40 of the 200 units must be Affordable. The proposed legislation would allow those 40 Affordable units to be exempt from the density calculation. This means 40 additional market-rate units could be added to the project. The new total number of units in the project is now 240. The 20% inclusionary requirement is taken from the total number of units in a project, not just the number of market-rate units. This means the new inclusionary number of units goes up. Which then means more market-rate units could be built . . ."

Here are the calculations:

200 units * 0.20 inclusionary rate = 40 units

New project: 240 units.
Another way of writing 240 is 200 + 40, or 200 + 200(0.20). In math,
240 =
200 + 40 =
200 + 200(0.20)

But wait! We have to find out what 20% of 240 is! No problem.
240(0.20) = 48

Ok so the new project is 248 units.
Another way of writing 248 is ...
248 =
200 + 40 + 8 =
200 + 200(0.2) + 200(0.2)(0.2)

But wait! We have to find out what 20% of 248 is! No problem.
248(0.2) = 49.6

Ok so the new project is 249.6 units.
Another way or writing 249.6 is ...
249.6 =
200 + 40 + 8 + 1.6 =
200 + 200(0.2) + 200(0.2)(0.2) + 200(0.2)(0.2)(0.2)

But wait! We have to find out what 20% of 249.6 is! No problem.
249.6(0.2) = 49.92

Ok so the new project is 249.92 units.
Another way of writing 249.92 is ...
\[
249.92 = \\
200 + 40 + 8 + 1.6 + 0.32 = \\
200 + 200(0.2) + 200(0.2)(0.2) + 200(0.2)(0.2)(0.2) + 200(0.2)(0.2)(0.2)(0.2)
\]

But wait! We have to find out what 20% of 249.92 is. No problem, 
\[
249.92(0.20) = 49.98
\]

Ok, so the new project is 249.98 units.

Another way of writing 249.98 is ...
\[
249.98 = \\
200 + 40 + 8 + 1.6 + 0.32 + 0.064 = \\
200 + 200(0.2) + 200(0.2)(0.2) + 200(0.2)(0.2)(0.2) + 200(0.2)(0.2)(0.2)(0.2) + 200(0.2)(0.2)(0.2)(0.2)
\]

But wait! I'll cut to the chase, because I think you can start to see the pattern. The next project size is 249.9928.
\[
249.9928 = 200 + 40 + 8 + 1.6 + 0.32 + 0.064 + 0.0128
\]

Every time we multiply the new project size by 20% we are adding smaller and smaller numbers. First we added 40, then 8, then 1.6 then 0.32 then 0.064 then 0.0128. To get the next number to add, we multiply the last number by 20%. Yes, a planner could do this forever, but since we are dealing in whole numbers, and because our inclusionary rate is less than 100%, after a while, the total number of units stops changing.

No one need do any of these calculations, forever or not, because the formula for this sum is known and has been known since at least 300 BC when Euclid's Elements was published. Possibly much longer. Elements is claimed by some to be second only to the Bible in number of editions and readership since the advent of the printing press.
FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE:
Sunday, May 31, 2020
Contact: Mayor’s Office of Communications, mayorspressoffice@sfgov.org

*** PRESS RELEASE ***

MAYOR LONDON BREED AND PUBLIC SAFETY OFFICIALS ANNOUNCE CURFEW IN SAN FRANCISCO TO BEGIN TONIGHT AT 8PM

Following a day of peaceful protests, incidents of vandalism and violence last night in San Francisco have highlighted the need for residents to stay home at night to protect themselves and their communities.

San Francisco, CA — Mayor London N. Breed, in consultation with the City’s public safety officials, announced last night that she will implement a citywide curfew beginning Sunday, May 31, 2020 at 8:00 p.m. The curfew requires people within the City of San Francisco to stay indoors from 8:00 p.m. on Sunday until 5:00 a.m. Monday, June 1, 2020.

The Mayor’s order comes following vandalism and violence yesterday evening, May 30, after a day of peaceful protests following George Floyd’s death in Minneapolis. This Order shall remain in effect until the Declaration of Local Emergency is terminated, or sooner at the direction of the Mayor.
“The murder of George Floyd is only the latest in a long history of African-American men who have lost their lives as a result of police violence. There is a lot of pain right now here in San Francisco and across the country,” said Mayor Breed. “We’re committed to doing the work to rectify past injustices and continue implementing reforms to ensure that our police force is not just policing our communities, but also a part of them as well. Peaceful protests in San Francisco will continue to have my full support and the full support of the City. Unfortunately, some of the violence and vandalism we saw last night is unacceptable, and we will be instituting a curfew beginning tonight. Please stay safe today. Let’s make our voices heard and keep the focus on George Floyd, Breonna Taylor, Ahmaud Arbery, and everyone else whose death demands our attention.”

Exemptions to the curfew include:
- Peace officers, firefighters, other City and County employees engaged in authorized emergency operations, members of the National Guard, or any other responding personnel deployed to the City and County;
- Individuals who can establish to the satisfaction of a peace officer that they are in such place for the sole purpose of traveling to a home or workplace or to obtain medical assistance;
- Authorized representatives of any news service, newspaper, radio or television station or network, or other media organization;
- People experiencing homelessness.

“Like Mayor Breed, I understand the strong feelings motivating people to protest what happened in Minneapolis, and all of us in the San Francisco Police Department are committed to protecting the constitutional rights and safety of everyone who wishes to express themselves in First Amendment activities,” said San Francisco Police Chief William Scott. “At the same time, we’re also seeing lawlessness and looting that has no place in our City. We will continue to enforce the law and protect public safety, and we ask all San Franciscans to heed the curfew order.”

“The San Francisco Fire Department responded to scores of incidents in the downtown area between Saturday afternoon and Sunday morning, often for small fires that were quickly contained. We will always support and protect our First Amendment rights. The majority of people taking to the streets are doing it peacefully, powerfully, and with respect and compassion for the cause they’re fighting for,” said Fire Chief Jeanine Nicholson. “However, yesterday following a day of peaceful protests, incidents of violence and vandalism ensued. Together we need to protect our communities from those not intent of peaceful protest. This curfew is in place to protect our San Francisco communities—and the safety of all who live and work in our city, and our first responders.”

“The women and men of the Sheriff’s Office are the community of San Francisco,” said Sheriff Paul Miyamoto. “We are people of color, people with family and friends, people who deal with social injustice and inequalities every day. We too are upset and frustrated by George Floyd’s death. When public safety is threatened, we stand by the Mayor and our fellow first responders to protect every resident, prevent further tragedy and violence and ensure a safe resolution.”

“San Francisco has a proud history of standing up against oppression and making our voices heard in the face of injustice,” said Mary Ellen Carroll, Executive Director of the Department of Emergency Management. “But the violence and vandalism we saw last night was shocking
and heartbreaking. One of the most important roles our 911 dispatchers provide to public safety is keeping our first responders informed and safe, yet last night our dispatchers were overwhelmed. This curfew is necessary to keep our community safe, and to protect our city’s first responders and essential employees.”

The City and County of San Francisco Department of Emergency Management will be using numerous alerting systems to ensure the public knows about the curfew and to whom it applies. These alerting systems include the Wireless Emergency Alert System, which sends a text message to all cell phones connected to a cell tower in San Francisco; the Emergency Alert System, which airs the emergency message on TV and radio; and AlertSF, the City’s standard emergency alert system that sends a text message or email to registered users. To register for AlertSF text your zip code to 888-777.

###
May 31, 2020

President Joel Koppel
and Honorable Commissioners
San Francisco Planning Commission
San Francisco City Hall

Re: Lights at St. Ignatius Field

Dear Commissioners:
Our family has lived in Parkside and the Sunset districts for more than 30 years – 25 years just three blocks from St. Ignatius Prep. Our three adult children graduated from St. Ignatius and continue to work professionally in the Bay Area, two in the medical field and currently on the front lines of the pandemic, the third a high school teacher. My husband and I consider their education at St. Ignatius to be the foundation on which they built their professional education. On graduating from St. Ignatius, they were ready to commit to university; and on graduating university with various distinctions, to take on careers that support and enhance the quality of life for all in their native city. The opportunity to be educated at a Jesuit school presented a major financial challenge for us, an immigrant family. We will always be thankful for the decision we made in sending our children to St. Ignatius, and we wish to support St. Ignatius in its effort to continue to provide for its student population.

My husband and I are writing in strong support for approval of lights at St. Ignatius Field in order to create more options for student athletes and also to allow St. Ignatius to implement a later start time in accordance to CA State law.

There are fewer spaces for students to practice field sports in San Francisco and allowing S.I. to build these lights will keep students closer to the campus rather than traveling great distances to practice.

Men and women educated at St. Ignatius College Preparatory provide leadership in all areas of life in this city. They are front-runners in service careers, and in nonprofit and volunteer projects wherever they settle. Important lessons in teamplay, in sustained commitment, and in stepping up to the plate when needed are learned through shared experience on the field. Students who participate as spectators along with their families gain a strong feeling of community by supporting their friends and fellow classmates. This is the cohesion needed in our city now in time of crisis. Every effort should be made to support the development of community and the pursuit of common goals. Where better to naturally nurture this growth than on a sports field?

Please vote YES! to the lights at St. Ignatius Field, yes to the consistent development of community and leadership in our youth; and thank you for your consideration.
Sincerely,

Seamus and Maureen Lundy
2174 33rd Ave.
San Francisco, CA 94116
Oriordanmaire524@gmail.com
Commissioners,

Please be advised that the 10 SVN case report (scheduled to be heard on June 11th) is being provided to you and the public two-weeks in advance under our Supporting Documents page.

https://sfplanning.org/resource/planning-commission-june-4-2020-supporting-documents

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
Oops.

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: "Ionin, Jonas (CPC)" <jonas.ionin@sfgov.org>
Date: Friday, May 29, 2020 at 5:01 PM
Cc: CTYPLN - COMMISSION SECRETARY <CPC.COMMISSIONSECRETARY@sfgov.org>, CTYPLN - SENIOR MANAGERS <CPC.SeniorManagers@sfgov.org>, "YANG, AUSTIN (CAT)" <Austin.Yang@sfcityatty.org>, KRISTEN JENSEN <Kristen.Jensen@sfcityatty.org>, KATE STACY <Kate.Stacy@sfcityatty.org>
Subject: CPC Calendars for June 4, 2020

Commissioners,
Attached are your Calendars for June 4, 2020.

Commissioner Chan,
In order to participate you will need to review the previous hearings and materials for items 13 and 14 on the DR Calendar. You may access the video and audio here:

http://sanfrancisco.granicus.com/ViewPublisher.php?view_id=20

and the packet materials here:

https://sfplanning.org/past-hearings-cpc

Cheers,

Jonas P. Ionin,
Director of Commission Affairs
FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE:
Friday, May 29, 2020
Contact: Mayor’s Office of Communications, mayorspressoffice@sfgov.org

*** PRESS RELEASE ***
MAYOR LONDON BREED ANNOUNCES THE FIRST NEW AFFORDABLE HOUSING DEVELOPMENT ON TREASURE ISLAND IS MOVING FORWARD

San Francisco, CA — Mayor London N. Breed today announced the City has taken a major step forward in the development of 104 permanently affordable homes on Treasure Island with the construction finance closing of the Maceo May Apartments. Site work and construction will commence this summer. The redevelopment of Treasure Island will ultimately include 8,000 new homes, over 27% of which will be affordable, 550,000 square feet of retail and commercial space, 300 hotel rooms, and 290 acres of public open space.

“These last few months have shown us how crucial it is to have a safe, affordable place to call home,” said Mayor Breed. “It’s more important than ever that we keep building high-quality affordable housing and supporting our most vulnerable residents. Making progress on these
new homes for veterans is an exciting step in the City’s promise create a revitalized Treasure Island and make San Francisco a more affordable place to live for everyone.”

Maceo May Apartments is a 100% affordable, all-electric modular-built housing project and is being developed by Swords to Plowshares (STP), in partnership with Chinatown Community Development Center. Maceo May Apartments will provide 104 permanent supportive housing units for homeless and formerly homeless veterans, including veterans who currently live on Treasure Island. STP is a charter member of One Treasure Island, a non-profit organization committed to fostering an equitable, inclusive, and thriving community that includes formerly homeless and low-income San Franciscans.

“As the first new affordable housing project on Treasure Island, Maceo May is an exciting part of the redevelopment that will provide critical replacement units for current residents, and house additional formerly homeless and low-income veterans,” said Supervisor Matt Haney. “The Island is one the most diverse and low-income communities in San Francisco, and it’s exciting to see new affordable housing come to life with the incredible partnership of Swords to Plowshares and Chinatown CDC.”

The building is named in recognition of the dedication and advocacy of Maceo May, a Vietnam War veteran who worked at STP for 12 years and subsequently served as a board member for 14 years, until his passing in 2014. Maceo’s advocacy played a crucial role in ensuring homeless veterans would be recognized and served on Treasure Island and in the Presidio, and he remains a role model today for his staunch perseverance.

Treasure Island was activated as a United States Naval Base in 1940 and played a substantial role in World War II and the Korean War. In 1993, the Federal Government placed the Treasure Island Naval Station on its Base Realignment and Closure list and it was formally decommissioned in 1997. In 1994, the City began to conduct hearings and community meetings that informed the redevelopment plan that will result in a new San Francisco neighborhood incorporating residents of various socio-economic backgrounds. The Treasure Island Development Authority (TIDA) was also formed in 1997 as a non-profit, public benefit agency dedicated to the economic development of the former Naval Station and the administration of municipal services.

“Local history has been made with the final financing approvals for the Maceo May Apartments,” said Sherry Williams, Executive Director of One Treasure Island. “After 25 years of planning, a former military base will now begin its housing development in earnest, with the first affordable project serving homeless and formerly homeless veterans. It is a fitting honor to those who have served and who have struggled with housing and it is a fitting tribute to Maceo May, our first Board President and Swords to Plowshares’ tireless Housing Director.”

“This is a tremendous milestone in the process of converting the Naval Station to civilian use, and it was important to everyone involved that this first project acknowledge the service of our nation’s veterans,” said TIDA Director, Bob Beck.

Maceo May Apartments will be completed in 2022 and is made possible by financing support from the Mayor’s Office of Housing and Community Development, TIDA, the State of California Veterans Housing and Homelessness Prevention Program, Raymond James, Silicon Valley Bank, and the California Community Reinvestment Corporation. Operating subsidies
will be delivered through the City’s Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing Continuum of Care program and the US Department of Housing and Urban Development’s Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing program.

“We are thrilled to be moving ahead with Maceo May Supportive Housing for formerly homeless veterans,” said Michael Blecker, Executive Director of Swords to Plowshares. “I think Maceo, our first-ever Housing Director and champion for homeless veterans, said it best himself that ‘former military bases that were once used to transform young men and women into instruments of war now are used to eliminate their depression, desperation and destitution while beginning to cultivate once buried dignity, dreams and aspirations.’ It truly represents the meaning of turning swords into plowshares.”

“Chinatown CDC is proud to be partnering with Swords to Plowshares to build housing for homeless veterans at a time when the cost of our homelessness crisis could not be more clear,” said Chinatown CDC Executive Director, Malcolm Yeung. “Starting construction on this critical supportive housing project in the middle of a pandemic and financial crisis is a huge accomplishment that took perseverance from our City and private financing partners. We are thrilled to be carrying out their mandate to build 104 apartments for veterans exiting homelessness.”

Community Driven Partners
Founded in 1994, One Treasure Island’s (One TI) charter was to ensure that supportive housing and employment programs for formerly homeless households were an integral component of the reuse plan. Maceo May was One Treasure Island’s first Board President. Since 1999 both market rate and formerly homeless households have been living in former Navy housing on an interim basis. Well over 10,000 homeless and low-income San Franciscans have been and continue to be served on Treasure Island in housing, employment and financial services provided by One Treasure Island and its members, including Swords to Plowshares and Chinatown Community Development Center who are codevelopers of Maceo May Apartments. Other One TI members include Catholic Charities, Community Housing Partnership, Mercy Housing California, Health Right360, Rubicon Programs, and Toolworks.

Redeveloping the Island
Treasure Island Community Development (TICD) was selected to be the master developer for Treasure Island in 2003 and played an integral role in shaping the reuse plan that was approved by the Board of Supervisors and then-Mayor Newsom in 2011 along with environmental findings and transaction documents. As the master developer, TICD is responsible for all utilities, site improvements, and other public facilities and infrastructure and will oversee the development of more than 6,000 market rate housing units. TICD’s first new residential project on adjacent Yerba Buena Island will be completed in 2021.

###
FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE:
Thursday, May 28, 2020
Contact: San Francisco Joint Information Center, dempress@sfgov.org

*** PRESS RELEASE ***

MAYOR LONDON BREED ANNOUNCES TIMELINE AND PLAN FOR SAFELY REOPENING SAN FRANCISCO

Plan formulated by the Economic Recovery Task Force allows outdoor dining, indoor retail, and certain outdoor activities to resume on June 15th, assuming they are allowed by the State; additional activities will be permitted to resume with modifications in phases.

As part of plan to safely reopen, San Franciscans will need to wear face coverings when around other people not in their household.

San Francisco, CA — Mayor London N. Breed today announced a plan for reopening San Francisco that will allow certain businesses and activities to resume with modifications in phases over the coming weeks and months. As long as San Francisco continues to make progress slowing the spread of COVID-19, meets key health indicators, and state guidance continues to allow more activities, San Francisco restaurants will be able to offer outdoor dining, retail businesses will be able to allow customers to shop inside with modifications, and additional outdoor activities can resume on June 15th. The City plans to allow additional activities and businesses to resume in July and August.
“Our residents have a lot to be proud of with how we responded to this pandemic, with many people making enormous sacrifices to protect the health and safety of their fellow residents,” said Mayor Breed. “We’re entering a new phase of this crisis and we feel comfortable that we’re at a place that we can begin reopening parts of our economy, but that is not to say that this virus doesn’t continue to threaten our city. As we begin recovering and reopening, all of us are going to have to play our part to adjust to the new normal until we have a vaccine, and we’ll continue to do everything we can to offer clear guidelines and precautions to support residents and businesses with the new adjustments that will be needed moving forward.”

San Francisco’s reopening plan is aligned with the State’s guidelines and is based on a San Francisco-specific risk model to control the spread of COVID-19 and protect public health. The plan is also informed by the work of the San Francisco COVID-19 Economic Recovery Task Force. The timeline for allowing certain businesses and activities to resume will be adjusted as needed based on public health data.

Part of San Francisco’s plan for safely reopening includes requiring residents to wear face coverings on most occasions when they leave their home and are near other people, both indoors and outdoors. The public also must comply with other health and safety requirements and recommendations such as social distancing, handwashing, and cleaning frequently touched surfaces. The Department of Public Health will issue a new Health Order today with updated requirements regarding face coverings.

San Francisco’s Plan separates the State’s second stage into three phases – Phase 2A, 2B, and 2C. San Francisco’s Phases 3 and 4 are aligned with the State’s stages. San Francisco has already entered into Phase 2A, which allows curbside pickup permitted for most retail, construction, elective surgeries, and outdoor businesses like carwashes, flea markets, and garden stores to operate.

San Francisco’s current Stay Home Health Order does not have an expiration date and will be amended over the coming weeks and months to allow for a gradual and safer reopening. Today’s plan details the next phases, and provides dates that the City anticipates additional businesses and activities can resume with modifications. The dates in the plan will be finalized through amendments to the Health Order or directives, and will be guided by health indicators. If the City makes progress faster than expected, then the timeline outlined below may shift to allow some reopening to occur earlier. For each phase, guidance will be issued to provide businesses and operators with adequate time for planning and compliance with health and safety requirements.

Guidance for personal activities and interactions, such as visiting friends, having play dates and dinner parties is forthcoming. The plan and timeline to reopen businesses and activities was created in coordination with the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency’s (SFMTA) Transportation Recovery Plan. For each reopening phase, SFMTA will add and adjust services incrementally.

“San Francisco’s early and aggressive actions were key to the success we have had fighting the coronavirus,” said Dr. Grant Colfax, Director of Health. “As we move to reopen, continuing to prioritize community health will be essential. Every San Franciscan can and must help if we are going to reach better times ahead. That means, covering your face, keeping social distance and getting tested if you have any symptoms. These actions have saved lives and are going to be more important than ever as we start to move around the city again.”
“San Francisco led the way with our public health response and we can lead the way again with a thoughtful and responsible approach to reopening,” said Assessor Carmen Chu, co-chair of the Economic Recovery Task Force. “Through the task force, we heard from hundreds of San Franciscans on the need to balance our public health needs with our ability to make ends meet and today’s announcement provides a roadmap for all of us to plan and prepare for the future.”

“As we move to reopen, this framework provides business with the information they need to plan their next steps towards recovery,” said Joaquin Torres, Director of the Office of Economic and Workforce Development. “And as our communities follow good public health practices, we will see an increase in the activities necessary to move San Francisco towards full economic vibrancy.”

San Francisco Planned Reopening Timeline
The list below does not include all the businesses and activities that the City has included in the plan for reopening. San Francisco will only allow reopening of businesses and activities that are permitted under the State’s guidelines. For full information about the City’s plan to allow additional activities and business to reopen in phases, go to SF.gov/reopening.

Phase 2A – June 1st
- Child care
- Botanical gardens
- Outdoor museums and historical sites
- Outdoor curbside retail for services with minimal contact (shoe repair, dog grooming, etc.)

Phase 2B – June 15th
- Most indoor retail
- Outdoor dining
- Summer camps
- Private household indoor services
- Religious services and ceremonies
- Outdoor exercise classes
- Professional sports games, tournaments, and other entertainment venues with no spectators
- Non-emergency medical appointments

Phase 2C – July 13th
- Indoor dining with modifications
- Hair salons and barbershops
- Real estate open houses (by appointment only)

Phase 3 – Mid-August – to be determined, will be more than one sub-phase
- Schools with modifications
- Bars
- Other personal services
  - Nail salons
  - Massage parlors
  - Tattoo parlors
- Gyms and fitness centers
- Playgrounds
- Swimming pools
- Indoor Museums

**Phase 4 – Date to be determined**
- Concert venues
- Live audience sports and performances
- Nightclubs
- Festivals
- All hotels and lodging for leisure and tourism

The Shared Spaces program, which Mayor Breed announced on Tuesday, May 26th, will allow neighborhood businesses to share a portion of the public right-of-way, such as sidewalks, full or partial streets, or other nearby public spaces like parks and plazas for restaurant pick-up and other neighborhood retail activity. Outdoor dining is permitted to resume locally on June 15th, and if the State allows outdoor dining by that time, restaurants will be able to apply for a permit to set up tables and chairs in the public right-of-way.

###