SAN FRANCISCO
PLANNING COMMISSION

Meeting Minutes
Remote Hearing
via video and teleconferencing

Thursday, July 30, 2020
1:00 p.m.
Regular Meeting

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Chan, Diamond, Fung, Imperial, Johnson, Koppel, Moore

THE MEETING WAS CALLED TO ORDER BY PRESIDENT KOPPEL AT 1:01 PM

STAFF IN ATTENDANCE: Aaron Starr, Miriam Chion, Claudia Flores, Kimberly Durandet, Jonathan Vimr, Claire Feeney, Jeff Horn, Carly Grob, David Winslow, Mat Snyder, Joshua Switzky, Corey Teague - Zoning Administrator, Rich Hillis – Planning Director, Jonas P. Ionin – Commission Secretary, Christine L. Silva – Acting Commission Secretary

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

A. CONSIDERATION OF ITEMS PROPOSED FOR CONTINUANCE

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

1. 2019-001613DRP
   2100-2102 JONES STREET & 998 FILBERT STREET – northeast side of the intersection of Filbert and Jones Streets Lot 017 in Assessor’s Block 0092 (District 3) – Request for Discretionary Review of Building Permit Application No. 2020.0127.2820, for the conversion of two (2) existing commercial storefronts to two (2) ADUs (Accessory Dwelling Units) per
City Ordinance No. 162-16 at the ground floor of an existing eight-unit building within a RM-1 (Residential-Mixed, Low 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).

(Proposed for Continuance to September 10, 2020)

SPEAKERS: None
ACTION: Continued to September 10, 2020
AYES: Chan, Diamond, Fung, Johnson, Koppel, Moore
ABSENT: Imperial

2. 2018-002124CUA (C. ALEXANDER: (415) 575-8724)
54 04TH STREET – west side of 4th Street and between Market and Mission Streets; Lot 034 in Assessor’s Block 3705 (District 13) – Request for a Conditional Use Authorization for hotel use pursuant to Planning Code Sections 210.2 and 303. The Project proposes a conversion of the 68 vacant residential hotel rooms (SROs) to tourist use. The subject property (Mosser Hotel) currently contains 81 residential hotel rooms and 87 tourist hotel rooms for a total of 168 rooms within a C-3-R (Downtown-Retail) Zoning District and 160-S Height and Bulk District. 13 tenants currently reside in the 81 residential hotel rooms, with 68 of them vacant. None of the existing tenants are proposed to be evicted. The Project Sponsor proposes to satisfy the one-for-one residential room replacement required by Administrative Code Section 41.13(a)(4) and (a)(5) by paying an in-lieu fee “to a public entity or nonprofit organization, which will use the funds to construct comparable units, an amount at least equal to 80% of the cost of construction of an equal number of comparable units plus site acquisition costs.” 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 June 18, 2020)

(Proposed for Continuance to September 10, 2020)

SPEAKERS: None
ACTION: Continued to September 10, 2020
AYES: Chan, Diamond, Fung, Johnson, Koppel, Moore
ABSENT: Imperial

3a. 2020-000052PCA (V. FLORES: (415) 575-9173)
STANDARD ENVIRONMENTAL REQUIREMENTS [BF TBD] – Various Code Amendments – Ordinance amending the Administrative Code to authorize the Planning Commission to standardize policies that avoid or lessen common environmental impacts of Development Projects, as defined; create a program to apply those policies as requirements to Development Projects that meet certain applicability criteria, in order to protect public health, safety, welfare and the environment while expediting environmental review for housing and other Development Projects; and to make conforming amendments to the Planning, Environment and Police Codes; affirming the Planning Department’s determination under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA); and making findings of consistency with the General Plan and the eight priority policies of Planning Code Section 101.1, and findings of public necessity, convenience and welfare findings under Planning Code, Section 302.

Preliminary Recommendation: Approve
(Continued from Regular hearing on April 30, 2020)
(Proposed for Indefinite Continuance)

SPEAKERS: Katherine Howard – I support the indefinite continuance of the SER and of the air quality part also
ACTION: Continued Indefinitely
AYES: Chan, Diamond, Fung, Johnson, Koppel, Moore
ABSENT: Imperial

3b. 2020-000052PCA

STANDARD ENVIRONMENTAL REQUIREMENTS – AIR QUALITY – Adopt Standard Environmental Review Requirements related to the topic of Air Quality.
Preliminary Recommendation: Adopt
(Proposed from Regular hearing on April 30, 2020)

(Proposed for Indefinite Continuance)

SPEAKERS: None
ACTION: Continued Indefinitely
AYES: Chan, Diamond, Fung, Johnson, Koppel, Moore
ABSENT: Imperial

4. 2019-016420CND

424-434 FRANCISCO STREET – north side of Francisco Street between Powell and Mason Streets; Lot 010 in Assessor's Block 0041 (District 3) – Request for a Condominium Conversion pursuant to Subdivision Code Sections 1332 and 1381 to convert three (3)-story, six (6)-dwelling unit building into residential condominiums. The project site is located within the North Beach Special Use District, the Telegraph Hill – North Beach Residential Special Use District, and the North Beach Neighborhood Commercial (NCD) Zoning District and 40-X Height and Bulk District. The proposal includes no physical change and is therefore not a project under CEQA.
Preliminary Recommendation: Approve with Conditions

SPEAKERS: None
ACTION: Continued to September 3, 2020
AYES: Chan, Diamond, Fung, Johnson, Koppel, Moore
ABSENT: Imperial

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.

6. 2020-006152GPR

MISSION BAY SOUTH REDEVELOPMENT PLAN AMENDMENTS – the Mission Bay South Redevelopment Project Area is generally bounded by Mariposa Street on the south, Interstate 280 on the west, Mission Creek on the north, and San Francisco Bay on the east (District 6) – General Plan Conformity Findings – Pursuant to Section 4.105 of the Charter
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and Section 2A.53 of the Administrative Code of the City and County of San Francisco, recommending General Plan conformity findings for an amendment to the Mission Bay South Redevelopment Plan, that would allow up to 50 additional hotel rooms at Mission Bay South Block 1 (100 Channel Street Assessors Block 8715, Lot 008); and making Planning Code Section 101.1(b) findings.

Preliminary Recommendation: Adopt Findings

SPEAKERS: None
ACTION: Adopted Findings
AYES: Chan, Diamond, Fung, Johnson, Koppel, Moore
ABSENT: Imperial
MOTION: 20771

C. COMMISSION MATTERS

7. Consideration of Adoption:
   • Draft Minutes for July 16, 2020

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

8. Commission Comments/Questions

Commissioner Johnson:
Hi everyone, colleagues and friends. I want to share that today is my last hearing on the Planning Commission. I let the Mayor know some time ago that I will be stepping off the Commission in order to say yes to some exciting developments in my personal and professional life. And I make that announcement with deep heartfelt gratitude. Over the last few years, it has been my absolute honor and privilege to serve. I have met so many amazing and brilliant people who are passionate about the future of our city, and -- including my colleagues, my fellow commissioners. You have become my colleagues and my friends, and I am really grateful for however short or long that we have had to serve together, for the opportunity to have gotten to collaborate and serve with each of you. I'm deeply grateful for the gifts that you bring to the Commission and your leadership and I can't wait to see how you carry on and what you are able to accomplish.

I have a few comments to so mark this occasion, so I am going to share quite a bit. The first thing that I want to say is thank you to the staff of the Planning Department. Your work is tireless and I've seen senior leadership inside and outside the Department. I know that often, for folks who work in the nonprofit or the public sector, we are tasked with tackling issues that are larger than us and often without the tools or resources to be able to fully engage and I've seen this department over the last few years and even over the last few weeks, take the challenge of this time and really run with it. And put yourselves out there and demand change and really see your role as reflected in our Racial and Social Equity vision which just re-imagining what the planning field can be - inclusive, diverse and one that centers Racial and Social Equity both as a practice and an indicator. And so, I am deeply grateful to all of the Planning staff.
I want to close this statement by just sharing a little bit about what I have seen in my reflections over my time on the Planning Commission. And some things that I hope that whoever follows me and this Commission as they carry forward, can keep in mind to really light the way through this challenging time in our city in order to advance a city that is better than we found it and one that really holds to the tenets and values of Racial and Social Equity and justice for all. I’ve often said that Planning is not just about the code. It’s about people’s lived experience and their lives. How we are going to wield our power to help the city evolve in the name of equity and opportunity for all. But in order to do that I think we have to get really clear on four questions so that we can be the most effective possible, especially during this time of great challenge.

The first is how do we, as a department and a commission set a tone for what development looks like in the city and lead by example by doing our own community-based planning and development work with the goal of reparations, regeneration and evolution. I think so often Planning Commissioners will say and it is observed by community members that projects start from the time an application is applied for and from that first preapplication meeting and the tone of those things really sets into course a set of motions that we see at the end of a project. Especially if they’re not done in a culturally competent way. And so how are we setting the tone from the beginning of how we’re doing development in collaboration that will lead to good development outcomes.

The second is how can we spend more of our finite time and resources on crafting visionary citywide policy. Our city is going to have to do more with less resources given everything that we know about COVID, and how it’s impacting the financial health of our city. And this has been something that actually every commission has – every commissioner who has left, I’ve watched all of their speeches, have talked about the need for the Commission to spend more time not less crafting citywide and neighborhood specific policies that will stabilize our city and encouraging in the flourishing of our neighborhood and communities. And we can’t craft that visionary legislation if we’re trying to determine the future of our city project by project or in a way that’s reactionary. And so, I hope that over the break and going forward, we can take the time to simplify focus and reform the way that we structure our hearings and things like discretionary review, to really elevate the conversation and help us reach the higher goals and higher needs of this time in our city.

The third is how do we stop the trauma and pain being inflicted on communities of color by changing our code to recognize the impacts of displacement and gentrification and being proactive in working to stabilize that community. And showing those communities that they matter by shifting where we develop to densities and neighborhoods with high incomes that are not at risk of displacement. For too long, affordable housing has been tied to the market rate housing. And as long as that tie happens and affordable housing is only a fraction of the housing that is being built, you’ll never reach your equity goals or affordability goals. And until we have findings related to those things, our racial and social equity work will always be discretionary. And our more equitable future relies on and cannot rely on discretion. And so, we need to find ways to really rectify the code to reflect those values.

And lastly, I always have thought of myself as a Planning Commissioner as a facilitator. I think we are facilitators of larger questions of values and the future of the city that we want
and how we all get there together. And we have to answer these larger questions about how we enable the physicality of our city to evolve while keeping and holding our shared values. And really encourage us to try to continue to elevate the conversation in our own minds and at these hearings because the old ways don't work and we can fight each other on whether this is an affordability crisis or a housing crisis until we're blue in the face and nobody is left to live in this city or we can recognize that what unifies us is that we want a better city where everyone has the opportunity to live, work and play and where racial and social equity are foundations of the future of the city and in order to do that it's time to be brave and bold and unite to do that work. Those are some of my reflections. I hope that we can cut through the fog of our San Francisco summer and project by project inertia to really kind of take a broader view of our role as a commission on the change that is being called to make. And I feel great pride and excitement that this group of people who are on the commission right now along with our planning staff and our community partners can make it happen. So, with that, I will just say, I won't be going far. I'll just be in the East Bay. I will be watching. I will be reminding you of these larger goals. And just thank you all so much for those opportunities and I wish you all the best. Thanks.

**Commissioner Fung:**
Good luck Milicent in your future endeavors. We will miss you.

**Commissioner Diamond:**
Milicent, I can't begin to describe the ways I'm going to miss your voice and presence on the Commission. You have been a guiding light to me since I joined. And your thoughtfulness and clear articulation of the issues that we need to be focused on has been a guiding star. I wish you the best of luck in your next endeavor and will continue to ask myself, what would Milicent do, as I think with the issues that we face. Best of luck to you.

**Commissioner Imperial:**
Also, good luck to you, Commissioner Johnson. I really wish we had more time to work together. I really admire the way you articulate things and the way you articulate items and I really wish we could spend more time and work together further. But I wish you all the best in your future endeavor. Thank you.

**Commissioner Moore:**
Goodbye as a colleague, hello as friend. You'll leave but you'll always be there. I think the depths of your thinking and the thoughtfulness profound and you'll be very very much missed. I was just feeling the amount of freedom and guidance when you started to really talk about the deeper aspects of social equity and you so openly and honestly sharing yourself. It was just like amazing. Thank you for that but we'll be friends.

**Commissioner Chan:**
Commissioner Johnson, I also wish we had more time together, but I have been really inspired and thankful for your guidance and your insight in the short time that I have been on the Commission together with you. I wanted to wish you all the best and please keep in touch.

**Rich Hillis, Planning Director:**
I know it's Commissioner Comments but as a former commissioner, and now -- It's truly been an honor and a privilege to work with you Milicent. I think you showed today, you've got,
just that knack in a unique way of looking at issues and making them – in your discussion of a practical and levelheaded, and also inspirational and forward thinking. You got a way to just elevate the discussion and the debate that is rare. You’ve crystalized it today. So, thank you for everything. You have been an inspiration to me, and I know to staff and to fellow commissioners and we’ll miss you. But truly hope you can stay involved as we move Planning forward. Thank you.

**Commissioner Johnson:**
Thank you all so much.

**President Koppel:**
Sad to see you go and glad you’re not going too far, and you brought a really important voice to our Commission which I don’t think we had prior to your appointment. Keep in touch and you know where to find us.

**Commissioner Johnson:**
Thank you.

**Jonas P. Ionin, Commission Secretary:**
I’ve already privately shared with you Commissioner Johnson my personal thoughts and feelings. But I will just say that your voice will be missed here on the Planning Commission and it will be San Francisco’s lost.

**D. DEPARTMENT MATTERS**

9. Director’s Announcements

**Rich Hillis, Planning Director:**
I wanted to make some comments on SB35 and how it relates to RHNA goals because the issue I think came up with Commissioner Diamond a week ago or so. And just some clarification but we can get you more information on this too and even in our next hearing about state legislations as we talk about it. But as you know SB35 streamline housing improvements when cities have not permitted sufficient housing to meet their eight-year RHNA goals and those goals are divided to affordable, lower incomes and above moderate income. And currently the city is meeting its above moderate goals but not its affordable and lower income goals. And so, projects that have 50% or more affordable can move through the process under SB35 in a streamline ministerial approval.

So, as we look to the next cycle, and our expectation is that the RHNA goals are going to be two to three times larger than the current cycle. The timing is a little interesting on how this works. SB35 needs to be re-authorized in 2026 so it is also unclear whether those requirements will still be applied, but it’s a look back over four years. Once the RHNA goals are set, the period of time is divided between the first four years and the second four years. And we look back as to whether we have met our goals and when SB35 takes effect. It’s a bit complicated. We can give you a memo that will explain this more but the provisions of SB35 and how they relate to our RHNA goals won’t necessarily apply until the new RHNA goals are adopted in there some time to look at how we’re meeting our resources. So, we can have more information on that in the coming weeks.
I also wanted to point out and thank our staff that are involved in the Share Spaces program particularly Robin Abad who’s been the city’s lead in implementing shared spaces. And I’m sure as you have been out and about over the last couple weeks you’ve seen the popularity of shared spaces. We’ve approved over 600 sites, and that’s both sidewalks only dining, and sidewalk and parking lanes and roadway improvements and our staff has been instrumental as MTA and DPW in implementing the program. There’s been 12 roadway closures. The first one being in Chinatown. We’re excited about how this is rolling out and moving forward. It's not without its kinks. We're working across the Departments to make sure that we can improve the timeline. We're working with nonprofits and communities to make sure that we're reaching out to neighborhoods that are perhaps under resourced and making sure that the advantages to this program be taken up by any neighborhood. So, I just wanted to give you a quick update on that and thank our staff particularly Robin for his efforts in this.

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

Aaron Starr:
First on the Land Use agenda was Supervisor Ronen’s ordinance that would allow arts activities, social service or philanthropic reliefs and COVID-19 recovery activities as temporary uses. This item was continued from last week so that the community could include the Planning Commission's modifications to extend the permit from a total of 2 years to a total of 4 years. This week the Committee sent the amended ordinance to the Full Board with a positive recommendation.

Next the Committee considered Supervisor Peskin’s ordinance that will codify the Planning Commission’s CB3 Program. Commissioners, you heard this item on May 21st and voted to approve the ordinance with modifications. Modifications included 1) in lieu of codifying the existing CB3 Program, principally permit at the first-story uses that contribute to the retail corridor vitality for a temporary period of 3 years; and 2) maintain controls on specific uses when existing restriction use districts or other measures quantitatively limit them. The Commission’s proposed amendments were not included in the ordinance and it moved forward as is. At the Land Use hearing, the Committee expressed general support of the ordinance. Supervisor Ronen’s office requested amendments to exclude the 24th Street Mission NCT from the ordinance. Public comment was overwhelmingly in support of the ordinance citing the need to cut red tape. After public comment, the Committee voted unanimously to accept Supervisor Ronen’s amendments. The Committee then voted to recommend the ordinance as amended to the Full Board.

Next the Committee considered Supervisor Fewer’s ordinance which would modify the 100% affordable housing and educator housing streamlined program, also known as Prop E, to allow extra height. It would also reduce the minimum lot size for qualified parcels from 10,000 sq ft to 8,000 sq ft. Commissioners, you heard this item on July 16th and voted to support the ordinance as drafted. The Land Use Committee forwarded this ordinance to the Full Board with a positive recommendation. Supervisor Yee’s ordinance that also amends Prop E and that you also heard on the 16th was not heard this Monday. His ordinance will be heard at the Land Use Committee in late August.

Finally, the Land Use Committee held a hearing on the City’s housing affordability and housing sustainability needs and relevant Planning Department reports. This hearing was
called at the request of Supervisor Mar’s office. Supervisor Mar said that the goal for calling the hearing was to emphasize the importance of data, and wants the City to prioritize and address the housing needs of residents and communities to ensure a diverse and racially equitable society, and that this needs to be the core of the City’s housing policy framework. He stated that there is a need for measurable data, quantitative goals and metrics, and that the City can only address what it can measure. Planning staff delivered a comprehensive presentation that covered a historical overview of racial and social inequities in San Francisco, an update on the impacts of COVID-19 on vulnerable communities, an overview and timeline for delivery of mandated reports including - area plan, monitoring reports, housing reports and reports related to economic activity and allocation of impact fees; the summary of finding of the 2019 housing inventory, housing balance report, RHNA annual report, and the 2019 quarter 4 housing pipeline, an overview of the Department’s housing strategies and the 2022 housing element update efforts. During the hearing committee members recommended various ways the Planning Department should present its data with more accuracy, particularly with RHNA goals. The Committee members also expressed concerns about how racial and social equity are being address by the Department. The Committee wanted to ensure that the racial and equity analysis doesn’t take a backseat to other demands of the Department particularly those paying the bills for the Department in the form of fees paid by developers.

Other recommendations by the Committee were to include data at the regional housing level including developing a dashboard that compares San Francisco to the rest of the bay area and to clarify how the city quantifies the loss of rent control units. A lot of public comment addressed racial and social equity issues and the relationships the Planning Department has had with the city’s African American community. Many commenters wanted the Planning Department to prioritize the needs of the people of color and low-income communities. Commenters wanted future housing reports to show the racial impact of housing imbalances and also wanted the City to address racist zoning regulations that help maintain the city’s segregated wealthy communities. Other comments expressed the need to prioritize affordable housing and to build more workforce housing to ensure that the City can house its essential workers. Comments also stood along the lines of those who wanted the city to only allow the construction of 100% affordable homes in the foreseeable future versus those that wanted to relax zoning controls, particularly in the west side, to allow more market rate housing to meet existing demand. As a follow-up to this hearing, a preliminary assessment on jobs and housing will be presented to the Committee in August and the jobs housing FIT report is targeted for delivery to the Committee by the end of quarter 3 2020. At the end of the hearing, the committee moved to continue the hearing and moved the housing balance report resolution forward to the Full Board. Next, the Committee continued supervisor Mandelman’s ordinance that would exempt affordable housing units in RH districts for density limits to a date uncertain.

And finally, the Committee heard the two legislative items for the Balboa Reservoir Project. The Planning Commission heard these items May 28th and recommended approval with Supervisor Yee’s proposed amendments. At the Land Use hearing, the Committee did not make any recommendations because the pending CEQA appeal. However, they did refer the item to the Full Board without recommendation. Public comment was either in support of the project and urging the city to build housing as fast as possible or gives the project objection to public land being sold to a private developer. These commenters generally felt that the land should either be turned over to a city college or should have 100% affordable
housing. Committee members discussed amendments to the DA, even though that was not under their purview at the moment, including the neighborhood preference radius for affordable housing and adding a use it or lose it clause. In the end, the Committee unanimously forwarded the items to the Full Board with positive recommendation.

At the Full Board this week, the amendments to the general plan, planning code and zoning map for the Hub project passed their second read. Supervisor Ronen’s ordinance that would amend the UMU Zoning District passed its first read. As did Supervisor Ronen’s ordinance that would allow the parking lot behind the El Rey theatre to continue operation for the next five years. Supervisor Peskin’s resolution initiating landmark designation for the Zackheim History of Medicine in California Frescoes was adopted.

Finally, the Board considered the CatEx appeal for the proposed project at 2651 Octavia. The project involves an addition of approximately 2,300 sq ft to an existing two-family residence. Noting the subject building is located immediately next to the Golden Gate Valley library. Commissioners, you heard this item on February 6\textsuperscript{th} as a discretionary review and voted to not take DR and approved the project as proposed. The appellant asserted that the Department issued the September 5, 2019 Class 1 CatEx improperly because it was issued without analyzing the project’s historic resource impacts from the library. It was issued without a shadow study assessing the project effects on the amount of natural light into the library’s reading room and that the correct CatEx was not included in the department’s staff report prepared for the Planning Commission’s hearing. In response, the Department contends the Department adequately analyzed the project’s impacts on both onsite and offsite historic resources including the library. No shadow analysis is required because the project is less than 40 ft in height. The quality of natural light in the library’s reading room is not a character defining feature identified in the designation report and the project would have negligible impact on the level of natural light in the reading room.

And finally, despite of the omission, the correct CatEx from the staff report for the DR hearing, the clerical error did not misinform the Planning Commissioners or members of the public because the staff report clearly state that the project qualifies for a Class 1 CatEx. In her comments, Supervisor Stefani whose district the project is at said the Department made procedural errors, including the Department did not analyze the project’s historic resource impacts until June 2020 when the Department published a preservation review memo and the Department prepared a shadow study after issuing the CatEx. As a result, Supervisor Stefani made a motion to overturn the Planning Department’s environmental determination which passed unanimously. EP staff will carefully review the Board’s findings once they are drafted to see how this decision impacts their CEQA review moving forward and what impacts it will have on the project itself. Thank you for your time. That concludes my report. And Commissioner Johnson I am going to miss you terribly and wish you the best of luck. Thank you.

E. GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT

At this time, members of the public may address the Commission on items of interest to the public that are within the subject matter jurisdiction of the Commission except agenda items. With respect to agenda items, your opportunity to address the Commission will be afforded when the item is reached in the meeting. Each member of the public may address the Commission for up to three
minutes. When the number of speakers exceed the 15-minute limit, General Public Comment may be moved to the end of the Agenda.

SPEAKERS:  Tess Welborn – Housing category, non-existing housing
            Georgia Schuttish – The intent of Section 317 (b) (2) (D) was to allow for the adjustment of the Demolition Calculations. It allows the Commission to respond to the market and preserve financial accessibility while preserving housing. Screenshots were emailed to the Commission on July 29th of the project at 271 Fair Oaks Street which sold in March 2020 for $6.3 Million. The previous sale in 2014 was $1.65 Million. This is an increase of $4.65 Million. The project's Demo Calcs were not published on the SFPIM, however this is a complete transformation and is a new building. The original building had a UDU behind the garage that was removed. This is now a very large SFH. This project was gutted, had a two-level vertical expansion, a horizontal expansion and a facade obliteration. Projects like this and many others illustrate why the Demo Calcs should be adjusted.
            Steven Buss – Commissioner Johnson
            Anastasia Yovanapolous – Inventory of vacant units
            Speaker – Market rate units

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, expediter, and/or other advisors.

11. 2016-003351CWP (C. FLORES: (415) 558-6473)

CENTERING PLANNING ON RACIAL AND SOCIAL EQUITY – Staff will present: (1) the Department’s current and proposed actions in response to the June 11, 2020 Resolution Centering Planning on Racial and Social Equity and (2) the recent progress on the Racial & Social Equity Initiative, including: A) Phase I Action Plan implementation status and B) Phase II next steps. Phase I contains goals, objectives and specific actions the Department is undertaking to advance racial and social equity in our internal functions. Phase II will focus on the external functions of the Department and will be submitted to the Office of Racial Equity in December and recommended for Commission adoption in early 2021. The Office of Racial Equity ordinance requires the Department to annually report on the action plan status, update the action plan every three years following adoption, and integrate the action plan within the Department’s strategic plan.

Preliminary Recommendation: None – Informational

SPEAKERS:  = Rich Hillis – Introduction
            = Miriam Chion – Staff presentation
            = Claudia Flores – Staff presentation
            + Corey Smith – Equity
            + Anastasia Yovanapolous – Community engagement
            + David Woo – Market rate housing
            + Sue Hestor – Fee base budget
            + Theo Gordon – Racist zoning
            + Sam – Exclusionary zoning and racism
12. **2018-009487SHD** (K. Durandet: (415) 575-6816)
811 Valencia Street – east side of Valencia Street and 19th Street; Lot 099 in Assessor’s Block 3596 (District 9) – **Adopt Shadow Findings** – Request for the Commission, upon recommendation from the Recreation and Park Commission, to make a determination that the shadow impact on Mission Playground will not be significant or adverse, pursuant to Planning Code Section 295. The project includes demolition of the existing single-story building, and new construction of a six-story, 55-ft tall, mixed-use residential building (approximately 7,454 square feet (sq. ft.)) with 18 single-room occupancy (SRO) dwelling units, approximately 540 square feet of Retail Sales and Service use, 19 Class 1 bicycle parking spaces, and 2 Class 2 bicycle parking spaces. The project site is located within the Valencia Street Neighborhood Commercial Transit (NCT) Zoning District and 55-X Height and Bulk. 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:** Adopt Findings

**SPEAKERS:**
- Kimberly Durandet – Staff report
- John Kevlin – Project sponsor presentation
- Sam – Shadow not an issue
- Theo Gordon – Non-existing impact
- Sue Hestor – 311 notices timing
- Sara Ogilve – Support
- Mike Chen – Support
- Martin Munoz – Support

**ACTION:** Adopted Findings

**AYES:** Chan, Diamond, Fung, Johnson, Koppel

**NAYS:** Imperial, Moore

**MOTION:** 20772

13. **2019-019722CUA** (J. Vimr: (415) 575-9109)
916 Kearny Street – south side at the intersection of Kearny Street and Columbus Avenue; Lot 013 in Assessor’s Block 0176 (District 3) – Request for a **Conditional Use Authorization** pursuant to Planning Code Sections 121.4, 303, and 810 to convert floors 3 through 7 of the landmark Columbus Tower (aka Sentinel Building) from an office use to a hotel. The hotel would occupy approximately 5,743 square feet and accommodate 15 guest rooms. Limited ground floor alterations are also proposed to create the hotel lobby and reception area. No changes are proposed for the exterior, ground floor restaurant, basement, second, or eighth floors. The project site is located within the CCB (Chinatown-Community Business) Zoning District and 65-N Height and Bulk District. This action constitutes the Approval Action for the project for the purposes of CEQA, pursuant to San Francisco Administrative Code Section 31.04(h).

**Preliminary Recommendation:** Approve with Conditions

**SPEAKERS:**
- Jonathan Vimr – Staff report
- Tara Sullivan – Project sponsor presentation
- Francis Ford Coppola – Project sponsor
- Marcelo – Architect, response to questions
ACTION: Approved with Conditions
AYES: Chan, Diamond, Fung, Imperial, Johnson, Koppel, Moore
MOTION: 20773

14. 2019-022627CUA
(C. FEENEY: (415) 575-9174)
1310 BACON STREET – north side at the intersection of Bacon and Amherst Streets; Lot 022
in Assessor's Block 5993 and Lot 072 in Assessor's Block 5992A (District 9) – Request for a
Conditional Use Authorization Planned Unit Development (PUD), pursuant to Planning Code
Sections 209.1, 303, and 304, for expansion of an existing Residential Care Facility (d.b.a
Gracenter) in a RH-1 Zoning District by constructing a new single-story 1,064 square foot
building. The new building will contain a communal kitchen and bedrooms for five patients,
increasing their capacity from 13 patients to 18. The Project site consists of two parcels that
collectively measure approximately 58,747 square feet and contain two existing buildings,
including a 5,045 square foot building that Gracenter currently operates out of and a 7,088
square foot building that houses the Sisters of Good Shepherd religious order. Under the
PUD, the project is seeking modifications to certain Planning Code requirements, including
rear yard (Planning Code Section 134). The project site is located within a RH-1 (Residential
– House, One Family) Zoning District and 40-X Height and Bulk District. This action
constitutes the Approval Action for the project for the purposes of CEQA, pursuant to San
Francisco Administrative Code Section 31.04(h).
Preliminary Recommendation: Approve with Conditions

SPEAKERS: = Claire Feeney – Staff report
ACTION: Approved with Conditions
AYES: Chan, Diamond, Fung, Imperial, Johnson, Koppel, Moore
MOTION: 20774

15. 2018-012576CUA
(D. WEISSGLASS: (415) 575-9177)
1769 LOMBARD STREET – south side of Lombard Street between Laguna and Octavia Streets;
Lot 027 in Assessor's Block 0506 (District 2) – Request for Conditional Use Authorization,
pursuant to Planning Code Sections 145.2, 303, and 712 to authorize an Outdoor Activity
Area in conjunction with a Kennel Use (d.b.a. “The Grateful Dog”) as well as a one-year
review of Motion No. 20355, which authorized the Kennel Use, within a NC-3 (Neighborhood
Commercial, Moderate Scale) Zoning District and 40-X Height and Bulk District. The Project
is not a project under CEQA Guidelines Sections 15060(c) and 15378 because there is no
direct or indirect physical change in the environment.
Preliminary Recommendation: Approve with Conditions
(Continued from Regular hearing on June 25, 2020)
Note: On March 5, 2020, after hearing and closing public comment, continued to April 23,
2020 for the sponsor to adhere to original conditions of approval by a vote of +6 -0. On April
23, 2020, without hearing, continued to May 28, 2020 by a vote of +6 -0. On May 28, 2020,
without hearing continued to June 25, 2020 by a vote of +7 -0. On June 25, 2020, without
hearing continued to July 30, 2020 by a vote of +7 -0.

SPEAKERS: = David Weissglass – Staff report
+ Tuija Catalano – Project sponsor presentation
- Speaker – Organized opposition
+ Joanne – Support
- John – Oppose
- Timothy Young – Impact on neighborhood property value
+ Emily Abraham – Support
+ Frances – Support
+ Rhea DeCarli – Support
- Renee – Oppose
+ John DeCarli – Support
+ Speaker – Support
+ Cynthia – Support
+ Speaker – Support
+ Benjamin Mayer – Support
- Speaker – Noise unbearable
+ Amelia – Support
+ Jennifer – Support
+ Dave – Support
+ Jonathan – Support
+ Speaker – Support
+ Gus – Support

ACTION: Approved with Conditions as amended to include the four additional conditions presented by Staff; subject to Staff reducing the number of dogs outside, with consultation of operator; and limiting outdoor use hours to 8 am – 6 pm.

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

MOTION: 20775

16. **2019-023628AHB** (J. HORN: (415) 575-6925) 
3601 LAWTON STREET – southwest corner of the intersection of Lawton Street and 42nd Avenue; Lot 001 in Assessor’s Block 1901 (District 4) – Request for HOME-SF Project Authorization pursuant to Planning Code Section 328 to demolish an existing one-story, 1,463 square foot gas station (dba 76) and construct a new five-story with basement, 46,050 gross square foot mixed-use building with a 2,826 square feet of commercial retail space and 41 dwelling units (which includes a mix of 27 one-bedroom, 13 two-bedroom, and 1 three-bedroom unit) on a 10,000 square foot project site. The project also includes 5,080 square feet of common open space, 1,635 square feet of private open space, 24 vehicle parking spaces and 41 Class I and 12 Class II bicycle parking space. The Project is pursuing a Tier 2 HOME-SF Project, which would permit form-based density and one additional story of height in exchange for providing 25% on-site affordable units. The project site is located within a Neighborhood Commercial Cluster (NC-1) District and 40-X Height and Bulk. 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 25, 2020)

SPEAKERS: = Jeff Horn – Staff report
+ Khodor Baalbaki – Project sponsor presentation
+ Speaker – Support
+ Sara Ogilvie – Support
- Eileen Boken – Opposed
+ Tyler – Support
+ Jake Price – Support
+ Paul – Support
+ Theo Gordon – Support
+ Bill McLaughlin – Support
+ Mark Macey – Support
+ Speaker – Support
- Speaker – Height
+ Sam – Support
+ Mike Chen – Support
+ Tim Chappel – Support
+ Robert Fruchtman – Support
+ Matt Wright – Support
+ Will – Support
+ Frank – Support
+ Martin Munoz – Support
+ Jake Shimano – Support
= Carly Grob – Response to questions

ACTION: Approved with Conditions as amended to work with staff to improve common corridor on ground floor and 4th floor units (31-33).

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

MOTION: 20776

G. DISCRETIONARY REVIEW CALENDAR

The Commission Discretionary Review Hearing Procedures provide for presentations by staff; followed by the DR requestor team; followed by public comment opposed to the project; followed by the project sponsor team; followed by public comment in support of the project. Please be advised that the DR requestor and project sponsor teams include: the DR requestor and sponsor or their designee, lawyers, architects, engineers, expediters, and/or other advisors.

17a. 2019-007159DRP (D. WINSLOW: (415) 575-9159)
145 MISSOURI STREET – between 17th and Mariposa Streets; Lot 022 in Assessor’s Block 3985 (District 10) – Request for Discretionary Review of Building Permit 2019.0503.9703 to legalize a first story horizontal addition and second story rear porch of an existing two-story single-family residence within a RH-2 (Residential House, Two-Family) Zoning District and 40-X Height and Bulk District. This action constitutes the Approval Action for the project for the purposes of CEQA, pursuant to San Francisco Administrative Code Section 31.04(h).

Preliminary Recommendation: Take Discretionary Review and Approve
(Continued from Regular hearing on July 16, 2020)

SPEAKERS: = David Winslow – Staff report
- Deborah Holly – DR presentation
- Kepa Askenasy – DR requestor
+ Amanda Johnson – Project sponsor presentation
- Peter Delacorte – Opposed
- Yvonne – Opposed

ACTION: Took DR and Approved with Staff Modifications
AYES: Chan, Diamond, Fung, Imperial, Johnson, Koppel, Moore
DRA: 713
17b. **2019-007159VAR**  
145 MISSOURI STREET – east side of Missouri Street between 17th and Mariposa Streets; Lot 022 in Assessor’s Block 3985 (District 10) – Request for Rear Yard Variance, proposing to legalize a rear porch that is 4 feet 7 inches by 17 feet 10 inches. The porch was built as a replacement of the previous porch within a RH-2 (Residential House Two Family) Zoning District and 40-X Height and Bulk District. The proposal is subject to a rear-yard variance per Planning Code Section 134.  
(Continued from Regular hearing on July 16, 2020)

SPEAKERS: Same as item 17a.  
ACTION: ZA Closed the PH and indicated an intent to Grant with Staff Modifications

18. **2018-011065DRP**  
3233 16TH STREET – between Valencia and Guerrero Streets; Lot 042 in Assessor’s Block 3567 (District 8) – Request for Discretionary Review of Building Permit 2018.0807.6659 to demolish an existing garage, storage shed, and garbage enclosure at the front and middle of the lot and construct an approximately 40-foot-tall, four-story, 2,360-square-foot residential building with five dwelling units at the front of the lot within the Valencia NCT (Valencia Street Neighborhood Commercial Transit) Zoning District and 40-X Height and Bulk District. The existing two-unit residential building would remain at the rear of the lot, and no modifications are proposed to that structure. 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*

SPEAKERS: = David Winslow – Staff report  
- Jenna Smith – DR presentation  
+ Gary Gee – Project sponsor presentation  
+ Speaker – Well designed, code compliant  
+ Speaker – Support  
+ Speaker – Support  
+ Yonathan Randolph – Support  
+ Suzanne Gregg – Support  
+ Shawn – Support  
- Rob Keller – Light  
- Alana – Oppose  

ACTION: Took DR and Approved with Modifications removing front door and replacing with window.

AYES: Chan, Diamond, Fung, Imperial, Johnson, Koppel, Moore  
DRA: 714

19. **2019-015999DRP**  
246 EUREKA STREET – between 19th and 20th Streets; Lot 010 in Assessor’s Block 2699 (District 8) – Request for Discretionary Review of Building Permit 2019.0815.8852 to construct a horizontal rear and third-story vertical addition, which is set back from the building front, over an existing two-story single-family residence within a RH-2 (Residential House, Two-Family) Zoning District and 40-X Height and Bulk District. This action constitutes the Approval Action for the project for the purposes of CEQA, pursuant to San Francisco Administrative Code Section 31.04(h).
Preliminary Recommendation: Do Not Take Discretionary Review and Approve

SPEAKERS: = David Winslow – Staff report
- Richard Brown – DR presentation
+ Karin Payson – Project sponsor presentation
+ Rob – Project sponsor rebuttal

ACTION: No DR
AYES: Chan, Diamond, Fung, Imperial, Johnson, Koppel, Moore
DRA: 715

5. **2011.1356PCA-02**
   (M. SNYDER: (415) 575-6891)
   CENTRAL SOMA CLEAN-UP [BF TBD] – Planning Code Amendment – Ordinance amending the Planning Code to correct typographical errors, update incorrect cross-references, and make non-substantive revisions to clarify or simplify Code language; enabling off-site usable open space to be provided at a greater distance; establishing a requirement for a POPOS Operations Strategy; clarifying lot coverage requirement for residential uses; clarifying what sides of narrow streets in Central SoMa are subject to solar plane setback and bulk reduction sky plane requirements; clarifying the geographic area in which Central SoMa Community Facilities fee revenue can be spent; clarifying that the Central SoMa Infrastructure Fee applies to both Tiers B and C for non-residential projects not subject to an office allocation; and clarifying the types of infrastructure projects that are eligible for SoMa Infrastructure fee revenue; affirming the Planning Department’s determination under the California Environmental Quality Act; making findings of consistency with the General Plan and the eight priority policies of Planning Code, Section 101.1; and adopting findings of public necessity, convenience, and general welfare under Planning Code, Section 302.

Preliminary Recommendation: Initiate and Consider Adoption on or after September 3, 2020

SPEAKERS: = Mat Snyder – Staff presentation
= David Woo – Summary of changes
= Anastasia Yovanapolous – Part of presentation only
= Joshua Switzky – Response to questions

ACTION: Initiated and Scheduled a Hearing on or after September 3, 2020
AYES: Chan, Diamond, Fung, Imperial, Johnson, Koppel, Moore
RESOLUTION: 20777

ADJOURNMENT 7:08 PM
ADOPTED AUGUST 27, 2020