

# SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING COMMISSION



## Meeting Minutes

Remote Hearing  
via video and teleconferencing

Thursday, July 9, 2020  
1:00 p.m.  
Regular Meeting

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Chan, Diamond, Fung, Imperial, Johnson, Koppel, Moore  
COMMISSIONERS ABSENT: None

THE MEETING WAS CALLED TO ORDER BY PRESIDENT KOPPEL AT 1:00 PM

STAFF IN ATTENDANCE: Aaron Starr, Xinyu Liang, Cathleen Campbell, Rich Sucre, Corey Teague - Zoning Administrator, Rich Hillis – Planning Director, Jonas P. Ionin – Commission Secretary

### SPEAKER KEY:

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

### A. CONSIDERATION OF ITEMS PROPOSED FOR CONTINUANCE

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

- 1a. 2018-008397CUA (K. DURANDET: (415) 575-6816)  
2005 17<sup>TH</sup> STREET – south side of 17<sup>th</sup> Street between Kansas and Vermont Streets, Lot 001J of Assessor's Block 3977 (District 10) – Request for **Conditional Use Authorization** pursuant to Planning Code Sections 303 and 317 to remove an unauthorized dwelling unit from the ground floor basement/garage level of an existing single-family, two-story residential building. The building would retain the one existing legal dwelling unit. The

subject property is located within a RH-2 (Residential House, Two-Family) Zoning District and 45-X Height and Bulk District. This action constitutes the Approval Action for the project for the purposes of CEQA, pursuant to San Francisco Administrative Code Section [31.04\(h\)](#).

(Continued from Regular hearing on May 21, 2020)

**(Proposed for Continuance to July 23, 2020)**

SPEAKERS: Herbert Terreri – Allow continuance

ACTION: Continued to July 23, 2020

AYES: Chan, Diamond, Fung, Imperial, Johnson, Koppel, Moore

- 1b. 2018-008397VAR (K. DURANDET: (415) 575-6816)  
2005 17<sup>TH</sup> STREET – south side of 17<sup>th</sup> Street between Vermont and Kansas Streets, Lot 001J of Assessor’s Block 3977 (District 10) – Request for **Variance** from the Zoning Administrator to reconstruct an unauthorized deck and stair with an addition of a firewall which extends into the required rear yard. Planning Code Section 134 requires the subject property to maintain a rear yard of approximately 23 feet. Therefore, a rear yard variance is required. The subject property is located within a RH-2 (Residential-House, Two-Family) Zoning District and 45-X Height and Bulk District.  
 (Continued from Regular hearing on May 21, 2020)  
**(Proposed for Continuance to July 23, 2020)**

SPEAKERS: Same as item 1a.

ACTION: ZA Continued to July 23, 2020

2. 2020-001294CUA (M. CHRISTENSEN: (415) 575-8742)  
2441 MISSION STREET – east side of Mission street, between 20<sup>th</sup> and 21<sup>st</sup> Streets; Lot 026 in Assessor’s Block 3610 (District 9) – Request for **Conditional Use Authorization**, pursuant to Planning Code Sections 754 and 303, requesting to amend Planning Commission Motion No. 19776 to authorize smoking and vaporizing on-site at the existing Medical Cannabis Dispensary (dba Mission Cannabis Club) within the mezzanine of the first floor of the subject property within the Mission Street NCT (Neighborhood Commercial Transit) Zoning District and 55-X Height and Bulk District.  
*Preliminary Recommendation: Approve with Conditions*  
 (Continued from Regular hearing on May 21, 2020)  
**(Proposed for Continuance to August 27, 2020)**

SPEAKERS: None

ACTION: Continued to July 23, 2020

AYES: Chan, Diamond, Fung, Imperial, Johnson, Koppel, Moore

3. 2019-014214DRP (M. CHRISTENSEN: (415) 575-8742)  
457 MARIPOSA STREET – between Third and Illinois Streets; Lot 043 in Assessor’s Block 3994 (District 10) – Request for a **Discretionary Review** of Building Permit No. 2019.0702.4973, which proposes to establish a new Cannabis Retail establishment of approximately 2,500 square feet in size, including on-site consumption, in an existing one-story Industrial building within an Urban Mixed Use (UMU) Zoning District and 68-X Height and Bulk District. Minor interior and exterior alterations are proposed to the subject tenant

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

(Continued from Regular hearing on May 21, 2020)

**(Proposed for Continuance to August 27, 2020)**

SPEAKERS: None  
 ACTION: Continued to August 27, 2020  
 AYES: Chan, Diamond, Fung, Imperial, Johnson, Koppel, Moore

6. [2019-015984CUA](#) (A. LINDSAY: (415) 575-9178)  
590 2<sup>ND</sup> AVENUE – on east side of 2<sup>nd</sup> Avenue between Anza Street and Balboa Street, Lot 026 of Assessor's Block 1544 (District 1) – Request for a **Conditional Use Authorization**, pursuant to Planning Code Sections 303 and 209.2, to install a new AT&T Mobility Macro Wireless Telecommunications Services Facility at rooftop consisting of installation of ten (10) panel antennas, and ancillary equipment as part of the AT&T Mobility Telecommunications Network. Antennas and ancillary equipment will be screened within two (2) FRP enclosures. The subject property is located within a RM-2 (Residential-Mixed, Moderate Density), and 40-X Height and Bulk Districts. This action constitutes the Approval Action for the project for the purposes of CEQA, pursuant to San Francisco Administrative Code Section [31.04\(h\)](#).

*Preliminary Recommendation: Approve with Conditions*

(Continued from Regular hearing on June 4, 2020)

SPEAKERS: None  
 ACTION: Continued to July 16, 2020  
 AYES: Chan, Diamond, Fung, Imperial, Johnson, Koppel, Moore

12. [2007.0604X](#) (L. HOAGLAND: (415) 575-6823)  
1145 MISSION STREET – southeast side of Mission Street; Lot 168 of Assessor's Block 3727 (District 6) – Request for **Large Project Authorization**, pursuant to Planning Code Section 329, to allow new construction of a six-story, 65-foot tall, mixed-use building (approximately 37,905 square feet) with 25 residential dwelling units, approximately 4,500 square feet of ground floor commercial, 9 below-grade off-street parking spaces, 1 car-share parking space, 30 Class 1 bicycle parking spaces, and 2 Class 2 bicycle parking spaces on a vacant lot. The Project includes a dwelling-unit mix consisting of 15 one-bedroom units and 10 two-bedroom units. The project site is located within a MUO (Mixed-Use Office) Zoning District and 65-X Height and Bulk District. This action constitutes the Approval Action for the project for the purposes of CEQA, pursuant to San Francisco Administrative Code Section [31.04\(h\)](#).

*Preliminary Recommendation: Approve with Conditions*

(Continued from Regular hearing on June 4, 2020)

**Note: On June 11, 2020, after hearing and closing public comment, continued to July 9, 2020 by a vote of +7 -0.**

SPEAKERS: None  
 ACTION: Continued to August 27, 2020  
 AYES: Chan, Diamond, Fung, Imperial, Johnson, Koppel, Moore

14. [2017-015039DRP](#) (D. WINSLOW: (415) 575-9159)  
 350-352 SAN JOSE AVENUE – between 25<sup>th</sup> and 26<sup>th</sup> Streets; 010A in Assessor’s Block 6532 (District 8) – Request for **Discretionary Review** of Building Permit 2018.0403.5430 for the construction of a horizontal addition and a 5’- 8” vertical addition to add eight dwelling units to an existing two-story, four-dwelling unit residential building within a RM-2 (Residential Mixed, Moderate Density) Zoning District and 40-X Height and Bulk District. This action constitutes the Approval Action for the project for the purposes of CEQA, pursuant to San Francisco Administrative Code Section [31.04\(h\)](#).  
*Preliminary Recommendation: Take Discretionary Review and Approve with Modifications*  
 (Continued from Regular hearing on June 18, 2020)
- SPEAKERS: Anastasia Yovanapolous – Continuance  
 Ozzie Rohm – Continuance  
 Steve Williams – Continuance
- ACTION: Continued to September 24, 2020
- AYES: Chan, Diamond, Fung, Imperial, Johnson, Koppel, Moore
15. [2019-000507DRP](#) (D. WINSLOW: (415) 575-9159)  
 3537 23<sup>RD</sup> Street – between Guerrero Street and San Jose Avenue; Lot 023 in Assessor’s Block 3846 (District 8) – Request for **Discretionary Review** of Building Permit 2019.0107.9729 to construct a two-story vertical addition and horizontal rear addition to an existing two-story single-family-home to add a dwelling unit to a single-family home within a RH-3 (Residential House, Three-Family) Zoning District and 40-X Height and Bulk District. This action constitutes the Approval Action for the project for the purposes of CEQA, pursuant to San Francisco Administrative Code Section [31.04\(h\)](#).  
*Preliminary Recommendation: Do Not Take Discretionary Review and Approve*  
**WITHDRAWN**
- SPEAKERS: None
- ACTION: Withdrawn

## B. CONSENT CALENDAR

All matters listed hereunder constitute a Consent Calendar, are considered to be routine by the Planning Commission, and may be acted upon by a single roll call vote of the Commission. There will be no separate discussion of these items unless a member of the Commission, the public, or staff so requests, in which event the matter shall be removed from the Consent Calendar and considered as a separate item at this or a future hearing

4. [2019-016969DRM](#) (D. WEISSGLASS: (415) 575-9177)  
 4326-4336 IRVING STREET – on north side of Irving Street between 44<sup>th</sup> Avenue and 45<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Lot 071 of Assessor’s Block 1706 (District 4) – Request for a **Mandatory Discretionary Review**, pursuant to Planning Code Section 311 to construct a one-story vertical addition to the existing three-story residential building within a RH-2 (Residential-House, Two Family) Zoning District and 40-X Height and Bulk District. Five ADUs (Accessory Dwelling Units) were previously approved at the ground story per permit no. 2018.1116.6157, resulting in 17 approved dwelling units at the property. Environmental review is not required for the Planning Commission to disapprove the project.  
*Preliminary Recommendation: Take Discretionary Review and Approve with Modifications*

(Continued from Regular hearing on June 25, 2020)

**Note: On June 4, 2020, after hearing and closing public comment; Continued to June 25, 2020 by a vote of +6 -0 (Johnson absent). On June 25, 2020, the Commission adopted a Motion of Intent to Approve with Staff Modifications, continued to July 9, 2020 by a vote of +7 -0.**

SPEAKERS: None  
 ACTION: Took DR and Approved with Conditions  
 AYES: Chan, Diamond, Fung, Imperial, Johnson, Koppel, Moore  
 DRA: [705](#)

5. [2019-000727CUA](#) (K. PHUNG: (415) 558-6373)  
 339 TARAVAL STREET – southeast corner of Taraval Street and 14<sup>th</sup> Avenue; Lot 036 in Assessor’s Block 2412 (District 7) – Request for **Conditional Use Authorization**, pursuant to Planning Code Sections 178, 303, 745, and 781.1 to establish a full-service Restaurant (d.b.a. “Backroom Dining/Mango Medley”) within the Inner Taraval Street Neighborhood Commercial District (NCD), the Taraval Street Restaurant Subdistrict, and a 40-X Height and Bulk District. A rear portion of the property was authorized for Restaurant use in 2012; however, the use was abandoned as it stopped operating as a Bona-Fide Eating Place in 2014. In 2018, the restaurant expanded into the existing street facing beauty salon without the benefit of a permit. Therefore, the CUA is required to 1) re-establish Restaurant use and 2) legalize the change of use from Personal Service to Restaurant with the expansion greater than 25% of the existing use size. This project was reviewed under the Community Business Priority Processing Program (CB3P). This action constitutes the Approval Action for the project for the purposes of CEQA, pursuant to San Francisco Administrative Code Section [31.04\(h\)](#).

*Preliminary Recommendation: Approve with Conditions*

SPEAKERS: None  
 ACTION: Approved with Conditions  
 AYES: Chan, Diamond, Fung, Imperial, Johnson, Koppel, Moore  
 MOTION: [20754](#)

## C. COMMISSION MATTERS

7. Consideration of Adoption:
- [Draft Minutes for June 18, 2020 – Regular](#)
  - [Draft Minutes for June 25, 2020 – Closed Session](#)
  - [Draft Minutes for June 25, 2020 – Regular](#)

SPEAKERS: None  
 ACTION: Adopted  
 AYES: Chan, Diamond, Fung, Imperial, Johnson, Koppel, Moore

8. Commission Comments/Questions

**President Koppel:**

I wanted to just take a minute and recognize a recently passed away former member of the Commission, former President, Ron Miguel. Not only did he serve tirelessly on the

Commission, but also was very accessible and often gave input at the hearings even after he left the Commission representing the Dogpatch and -- very well the Dogpatch and Potrero Hill areas. I would like to hear what other commissioners might want to say.

**Commissioner Moore:**

I want to remember him fondly. I served with him for five years. He is an untiring urbanist and he will be greatly missed. His activism during and after his serving on the Commission was remarkable and I actually still talked to him when he frequented us at public comments at our commission hearings. In early March I talked with him when he was in perfect health and he was telling me about all his plans and was just as active and participatory as he always was. Beyond my acknowledgment of commissioner -- as commissioner, I would like to actually acknowledge staff for their remarkable work in making these virtual hearings possible. There is Chan, there is Christine, there is Genta and most obviously, the one we see, Jonas, himself. But behind the scenes there is a tremendous amount of work and I'm always with awed when this all comes together as smoothly as it does. Thank you to everybody.

**Commissioner Johnson:**

Thank you. I want to echo both my fellow commissioners and just wanting to take a moment to honor former Commissioner Ron Miguel. I got to collaborate with him on an event at SPUR in February entitled "Re-envisioning the Planning Commission" and in that meeting and in every other time I've ever had the opportunity to interact with him, I was just always struck by his real passion for our city, for our communities and for changes that need to be made. And for volunteering his time is really as, you know, community activist to deal with issues of land use and policy. I actually wanted to honor him by sharing some of the perspectives that he shared. The recommendations for this body and how it could be structured and work going forward as a way to improve on it. It's very rare that people have the perspective of being on the other side of the dais and I thought some of his ideas were really astute. And so, I won't be able to share them with the same spirit that he always was willing to share his perspectives on issues. But I just wanted to share a little bit.

So, he has started by talking about the role of the Planning Commission, how it started to out to advise and recommend the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors Departments. And deal with upholding the General Plan, issues of land use, current planning, transportation and so on and so forth. Then brought up an issue that many others that evening and even in public comment have come up frequently from people just on what happens in the system of planning when change needs to be initiated because we are this body that sits between the Board of Supervisors, the City Departments, the Mayor, Commissions, it often comes that there is a question of who initiates change. And the change in major of the Planning Commission is such that our case load has increased to a level at which it's incredibly hard to be proactive on the issues of policy and land use and initiating that change. And his charged really to us from place of being reactive to Board of Supervisors, to the mayor, to the departments, to being proactive in authoring and creating new legislation and new change. He had some ideas for maybe how even our seats and our terms could be changed. He thought that there are seven commissioners and that the City might be divided into seven Planning districts to spread out a representation. He was supportive and actually said twice during his presentation that he felt that there should be term limits of two 4-year terms. He felt really strongly that we should consider subcommittees. Committees for discretionary reviews, committees for legislature review

and committees for code changes. So that we could do both well. We could adjudicate DRs and we could make new legislative changes and code changes. And, of course, he talked about the challenge of enforcement given the way that we are configured right now. He talked a lot about feeling like the Planning Commission gets cases too late and that commissioners being engaged earlier on in the process from the beginning, early on projects, would be helpful in helping us to be proactive. So, in his honor and in that spirit, I just wanted to echo some ideas that we can all keep in mind and even consider what it would be like to implement some of those things in his honor. Thanks for letting me share that perspective.

**Commissioner Moore:**

Thank you, Commissioner Johnson, for bringing him back, literally right into the discussion, remarkable description. Thank you so much. May I ask in follow up on your comment and Commissioner Koppel's comment that we close tonight's meeting in his honor?

**President Koppel:**

Absolutely.

**Commissioner Johnson:**

I would like that, thank you.

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

I would like to express my condolences to his family and simply express that I was always in awe of how articulate he was and how grounded his comments were.

**D. DEPARTMENT MATTERS**

9. Director's Announcements

**Rich Hillis, Planning Director:**

Thank you, commissioners, I just wanted to do the same and recognize former Commissioner Ron Miguel and pass on the Department's condolences to his wife, kids and family. I got to know him over the last couple of decades working with him as he sat on the Commission here. I often presented as a city staff person before him, but also sought out his advice and guidance. I think from Commissioner Johnson's description, he always had great advice that was direct and concise and was to the point. It was implementable and I sought that out often. Even after I sat on the Commission, he set out his advice on how to be a good commissioner. He was tremendously respected by city staff and staff within the Planning Department. He helped shape the Market-Octavia Plan, the Eastern Neighborhood Plan, the Transit Center district when he was a commissioner. He had a keen understanding of San Francisco in our neighborhoods and will be sorely missed. Thank you, all for your comments. That concludes my report.

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

**Aaron Starr:**

Good afternoon commissioners. Aaron Starr, Planning Department staff. I hope you all had a safe and restful 4<sup>th</sup> of July weekend. While you did not meet last week, the Board did. So, this week's report will cover both this and last week.

At last week's Land Use hearing, there were no Planning Department items. However, last week, the Small Business Commission considered Supervisor Peskin's ordinance that would codify the Planning Commission's CB3P program, institute the half feet for eligible CU applications and provide a refund for applicants if the item was not heard within 90 days. Lee Hepner from Supervisor Peskin's office was there to present the item to the Commission and I presented the Planning Commission's recommendation and rationale for the recommendation. Overall, the Commission was very supportive of Peskin's ordinance but was also sympathetic to the Planning Commission's recommendation at first. Commission questioned Lee about the need to codify an already successful program and on the limitations resulting from codifying the program. Mr. Hepner asserted that the Planning Commission's action actually endorsed the idea of codifying the program by recommending approval with modifications. I did correct the record and reiterate that the Commission's recommendation was in lieu of codifying the program. As further justification for the ordinance, Mr. Hepner cited two examples that both took an unusually long amount of time to reach on a hearing for a CU authorization. It was not clear if these projects would have been eligible for the CP3P program and why there was a delay, but these anecdotal examples did seem to persuade the Small Office Commission. Discussion then turned to the Planning Department's motive for not supporting the codification. After I attempted to defend the motives of department staff and the work we do, Commissioner Yekutieli countered by comparing the service provided from the Planning Information Counter to the DMV. Commissioner Adams then agreed with and gave his own less than flattering story about processing a CU with the Planning Department. The Commission ultimately decided to recommend approval of Supervisor Peskin's ordinance with the modification that 60-day extension period be removed to provide business owners with more certainty.

At the Full Board last week, the Board considered the CU appeal for the project at 1420 Taraval Street. The decision before them was whether to uphold or overturn the Planning Commission's approval of the conditional use authorization for the demolition of an existing 2100 sq ft, three-story single-family home and the construction of a new four-story mixed-use building with three dwelling units on the ground floor. The Planning Commission heard this item on January 30<sup>th</sup> and voted to approve the conditional use authorization, with the condition that the building's height be reduced from 45 ft to 42 1/2. The appellant raised four main issues under the Department's purview, in their written appeal. The first was that the proposed project is not consistent with the objectives 2 and 3 of the housing element or Planning Code section 101.1. The second issue was that the proposed project decreases naturally affordable housing in the Parkside District. The third issue was that the project destroys a rare historic resource and negatively impacts the look, the feel and character of the Parkside District. And finally, the project would block a property line window. Staff responded to each of these points in its presentation to the Board as did the project sponsor and his representative. All the comment was related towards to supporting the appeal with most comments are concerned about the loss of the building which they claimed was historic and the changing character of the Parkside



District. There are approximately four speakers in favor of the project, felt this is a great addition to the neighborhood and added housing in a thoughtful way. There are only a few questions from the Board. Notably, Supervisor Mar asked Planning's preservation staff how the Department's preservation standards account for historically working-class neighborhoods like the Parkside where building such fewer architectural character takes as a matter of economy. In the end, Supervisor Mar made a motion to uphold the CU and deny the appeal because the project helped address the housing crisis in San Francisco and was an appropriate development type for the neighborhood. Further, the benefits of creating three new family-sized units outweigh the loss of one single-family home. The motion passed 10-1, with Supervisor Peskin voting against it. Peskin did not make any remarks during the hearing that would indicate why he voted no on the motion.

This week, the Land Use Committee heard Supervisor Peskin's ordinance that would allow the expansion of the Central Station in the North Beach Neighborhood Commercial District. This Commission waived their opportunity to hear this item because it was so limited in scope. The item passed out of the Committee with a unanimous vote. There were no Planning items at this week's Board hearing. Finally, last week, Supervisor Peskin introduced a new ordinance that would fix an error caused by the Chinatown Reorganization Ordinance which passed last year. The Chinatown Reorg inadvertently prohibited non-retail professional services in the Chinatown Community Business District where before the reorganization, it was permitted. This ordinance will fix that error and allow the use on the second and third floors. Since this ordinance will fix an error caused by the Chinatown Reorganization Ordinance and the Commission recommendation when it passed that ordinance was to allow modifications that would maintain existing controls, staff has determined that this ordinance does not need to come before this Commission for a public hearing unless we hear otherwise from you today. In which case we would be happy to notice the item and bring it to you for your review and consideration. That concludes my report and I'm available for questions.

## E. GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT

SPEAKERS: Georgia Schuttish – Demo calcs, 311 notification  
Ozzie Rohm – Projects after SIP  
Yonathan Randolph – Demo calcs, tantamount to demolition

## F. REGULAR CALENDAR

The Commission Hearing Procedures provide for presentations by staff; followed by the project sponsor team; followed by public comment for and against the proposal. Please be advised that the project sponsor team includes: the sponsor(s) or their designee, lawyers, architects, engineers, expeditors, and/or other advisors.

11. [2019-002743CRV](#) (X. LIANG: (415) 575-9182)  
853 JAMESTOWN AVENUE – located on the south side of Jamestown Avenue at the intersection between Griffith Street and Jamestown Avenue, Lot 276 in Assessor's Block 4991 (District 10) – Request for **Concession/Incentive and Waiver from Development Standards**, pursuant to Planning Code Section 206.6 and California Government Code Section 65915 to pursue the State Density Bonus Law. The Project proposes new construction of 122 residential units in 20 buildings on a 6.87-acre vacant parcel along

Jamestown Avenue within the RH-2 (Residential- House, Two-Family) Zoning District and a 40-X Height and Bulk District. The unit size varies from 1,100 to 1,550 square feet, and each will contain two-or three-bedrooms. Most units will be three-story attached townhome-style condominiums with private garages at-grade. In total, the project will include approximately 169,332 square feet of residential use with 153 private vehicular parking spaces, 17 guest parking spaces, and 122 Class 1 and 8 Class 2 bicycle parking spaces. This action constitutes the Approval Action for the project for the purposes of CEQA, pursuant to San Francisco Administrative Code Section [31.04\(h\)](#).

*Preliminary Recommendation: Approve Findings*

SPEAKERS: = Xinyu Liang – Staff report  
 + Jesse Blout – Project presentation  
 + Elouise Patton – Support  
 + Linda Fadeke Richardson – Adding value to area  
 + Speaker – Support  
 + Dr. Veronica Honeycutt – Support  
 + Shirley Moore – Support  
 + Sarah Gill – Response to questions  
 = Rich Sucre – Response to questions  
 ACTION: Adopted Findings as Amended by Staff  
 AYES: Chan, Diamond, Fung, Imperial, Johnson, Koppel, Moore  
 RESOLUTION: [20755](#)

- 13a. [2019-000013CUA](#) (C. CAMPBELL: (415) 575-8732)  
[552-554 HILL STREET](#) – north side of Hill Street, between Noe and Castro Streets; Lot 065 in Assessor’s Block 3622 (District 8) – Request for **Conditional Use Authorization** pursuant to Planning Code Sections 209.1, 303 and 317, to legalize the merger of two Residential Flats and the unauthorized removal and relocation of one dwelling unit to basement level within a RH-2 (residential- house, two family) Zoning District with 40-X Height and Bulk designation. The proposed project would also legalize an unauthorized rear building and deck expansion. This action constitutes the Approval Action for the project for the purposes of CEQA, pursuant to San Francisco Administrative Code Section [31.04\(h\)](#).

*Preliminary Recommendation: Disapprove*

(Continued from Regular hearing on June 11, 2020)

SPEAKERS: = Cathleen Campbell – Staff report  
 + Ryan Patterson – Project presentation  
 + Bob Roddick – Project presentation  
 - Ozzie Rohm – Disapprove  
 + Speaker – Reasonable  
 = Corey Teague – Response to questions  
 = Kate Stacey – Response to questions  
 ACTION: Disapproved  
 AYES: Chan, Imperial, Johnson, Moore  
 NAYS: Diamond, Fung, Koppel  
 MOTION: [20756](#)

- 13b. [2019-000013VAR](#) (C. CAMPBELL: (415) 575-8732)  
552-554 HILL STREET – north side of Hill Street, between Noe and Castro Streets; Lot 065 in Assessor’s Block 3622 (District 8) – Request for **Variance** from the Zoning Administrator to legalize the unauthorized removal & relocation of one dwelling unit to basement level, the horizontal building and deck expansion on an existing two-dwelling unit building. The existing building is non-conforming, and the unauthorized rear building and deck additions encroach approximately 11 feet 4 inches into the required rear yard and result in a rear yard of 28 feet 6 inches. Planning Code Section 134 requires the subject property to maintain a rear yard of 39 feet 10 Inches. Therefore, a rear yard variance is required. Planning Code Section 140 requires each dwelling unit to face on an open area meeting minimum dimensions. The relocated dwelling unit does not meet the minimum requirements. Therefore, an exposure variance is required. Planning Code Section 135 requires the subject project to provide 166 square feet of common usable open space for each dwelling unit. The relocated dwelling unit would not comply with the open space requirement. Therefore, an open space variance is required. The subject property is located within a RH-2 (Residential House, Two Family) Zoning District and 40-X Height and Bulk District.

(Continued from Regular hearing on June 11, 2020)

SPEAKERS: Same as item 13a.

ACTION: ZA Closed the PH and indicated an intent to Deny

ADJOURNMENT 2:58 PM - IN HONOR OF RON MIGUEL  
ADOPTED JULY 23, 2020