

From: [CPC-Commissions Secretary](#)
Cc: [Feliciano, Josephine \(CPC\)](#)
Subject: FW: 1950 Page LETTER TO THE COMMISSION
Date: Thursday, October 08, 2020 10:42:16 AM
Attachments: [letter xian yun academy of the arts.docx](#)
[image015.png](#)
[image016.png](#)
[image017.png](#)
[image018.png](#)
[image019.png](#)
[image020.png](#)
[image021.png](#)

Commission Affairs

San Francisco Planning Department
49 South Van Ness Avenue, Suite 1400, San Francisco, CA 94103
Direct: 628.652.7600 | www.sfplanning.org
[San Francisco Property Information Map](#)



Due to COVID-19, San Francisco Planning is not providing any in-person services, but we are operating remotely. Our staff are [available by e-mail](#), and the Planning and Historic Preservation Commissions are convening remotely. The public is [encouraged to participate](#). Find more information on our services [here](#).

From: Susan Latham <sdlatham@prodigy.net>
Sent: Thursday, October 08, 2020 10:39 AM
To: CPC-Commissions Secretary <commissions.secretary@sfgov.org>; Woods, Mary (CPC) <mary.woods@sfgov.org>
Subject: 1950 Page LETTER TO THE COMMISSION

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

From a neighbor who does not have internet service.

~susan

From: [sherry hugi](#)
Sent: Thursday, October 8, 2020 10:15 AM
To: [Susan Latham](#)
Subject: Re: If you want to send to Planning Commission: use any part anyway. Please do!

Susan,

Here is the letter I sent. Unfortunately, I do not have the internet so I must go to Fed Ex to do all the work. Also, I will call to join meeting, but I am not guaranteed admittance.

Sherry

From: Susan Latham <sdlatham@prodigy.net>

Sent: Wednesday, October 7, 2020 4:28 PM

To: sherry hugi <sherryhugi@hotmail.com>

Subject: If you want to send to Planning Commission: use any part any way. Please do!

Commission Affairs

commissions.secretary@sfgov.org

Institute of Arts and Culture
1950 Page Street
San Francisco, CA 94117

I respectfully submit concerns and observations, attached, regarding the plan submitted the Planning Department by Institute for Arts and Culture, 1950 Page Street, San Francisco, CA 94117. The documents under review are 1950 Page Plans rev 5.1.2020, as well as 1950 Page CEQA.

Please recognize that this is a small neighborhood, a community that care for each other. Your organization has made it very clear to us that your philosophy is: More.

No matter how many parking spaces the school wants to add, parents will continue to double park, que up at the front door.

The “majority of double parkers” are NOT delivery vehicles (as per James, Urban Planner).

Staff & parents most often leave the car driverless and spend time in the school. Staff park their cars in all white zones all day only moving when another space opens in Page Street, sometimes taking up a two space spot by parking in the middle to save for another school affiliated car.

Staff also bogart parking spaces, only moving when an associate shows up to take the space as arranged. Driver will not acknowledge another non-associate driver, who seeing someone sitting in their car, waits for car to vacate parking space. The waiting driver is not waved on, but finally leaves.

****Reported to 311 09.27.2020**

Demolition Derby on Page & Stanyan: 1950 Page School staff see a parking space, rush to car, sloppy U turns mid block to grab yet another space. This "school" has no sense of place. They move their car to give to another school affiliate. Bad Neighbor

[@SF311](#)

The above instances are frequent, daily. What can be done?

The Boys & Girls Club had an arrangement with Kezar Parking, especially for the large buses that would take the kids to Camp Mendocino; everyone meeting there for an enjoyable send off. Why not work with Kezar Parking to arrange designated staff parking? Really, why?

The impact of (adding more spaces for your organization) on neighbors and service vehicles is far greater than the benefit to the school, which, with this expansion outgrows the tiny community, overwhelming everything around it. When staff responds

Is there a way to be a better neighbor to the community, to be part of our tiny community? Times are hard enough. We want this to work for all.

We appeal to you to take responsibility and take corrective action.

Respectfully,

~susan latham

From: [CPC-Commissions Secretary](#)
To: [Feliciano, Josephine \(CPC\)](#); [Woods, Mary \(CPC\)](#)
Subject: FW: Opposition to 1950 Page Street Plans rev 5.1.2020
Date: Thursday, October 08, 2020 10:41:53 AM
Attachments: [letter xian yun academy of the arts.docx](#)
[image013.png](#)
[image014.png](#)
[image015.png](#)
[image016.png](#)
[image017.png](#)
[image018.png](#)

Commission Affairs

San Francisco Planning Department
49 South Van Ness Avenue, Suite 1400, San Francisco, CA 94103
Direct: 628.652.7600 | www.sfplanning.org
[San Francisco Property Information Map](#)



Due to COVID-19, San Francisco Planning is not providing any in-person services, but we are operating remotely. Our staff are [available by e-mail](#), and the Planning and Historic Preservation Commissions are convening remotely. The public is [encouraged to participate](#). Find more information on our services [here](#).

From: sherry hugi <sherryhugi@hotmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, October 08, 2020 10:07 AM
To: Imperial, Theresa (CPC) <theresa.imperial@sfgov.org>; CPC-Commissions Secretary <commissions.secretary@sfgov.org>; Koppel, Joel (CPC) <joel.koppel@sfgov.org>; Moore, Kathrin (CPC) <kathrin.moore@sfgov.org>; Chan, Deland (CPC) <deland.chan@sfgov.org>; Diamond, Susan (CPC) <sue.diamond@sfgov.org>; Fung, Frank (CPC) <frank.fung@sfgov.org>
Subject: Opposition to 1950 Page Street Plans rev 5.1.2020

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

Attached is the Opposition Letter to 1950 Page Street Plans rev 5.1.2020 for your review.

Thank you.

Sherry Hugi

From: [CPC-Commissions Secretary](#)
To: [Feliciano, Josephine \(CPC\)](#)
Subject: FW: Opposition to 1950 Page Plans rev 5.1.2020
Date: Thursday, October 08, 2020 9:54:32 AM
Attachments: [1950 Page Letter-Denise Bradley.pdf](#)
[image013.png](#)
[image014.png](#)
[image015.png](#)
[image016.png](#)
[image017.png](#)
[image018.png](#)

Commission Affairs

San Francisco Planning Department
49 South Van Ness Avenue, Suite 1400, San Francisco, CA 94103
Direct: 628.652.7600 | www.sfplanning.org
[San Francisco Property Information Map](#)



Due to COVID-19, San Francisco Planning is not providing any in-person services, but we are operating remotely. Our staff are [available by e-mail](#), and the Planning and Historic Preservation Commissions are convening remotely. The public is [encouraged to participate](#). Find more information on our services [here](#).

From: denise bradley <sfodab@hotmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, October 08, 2020 9:41 AM
To: CPC-Commissions Secretary <commissions.secretary@sfgov.org>
Subject: Fw: Opposition to 1950 Page Plans rev 5.1.2020

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

From: denise bradley
Sent: Thursday, October 8, 2020 9:38 AM
To: joel.koppel@sfgov.org <joel.koppel@sfgov.org>; kathrin.moore@sfgov.org <kathrin.moore@sfgov.org>; sue.diamond@sfgov.org <sue.diamond@sfgov.org>; frank.fung@sfgov.org <frank.fung@sfgov.org>; theresa.imperial@sfgov.org <theresa.imperial@sfgov.org>; deland.chan@sfgov.org <deland.chan@sfgov.org>
Cc: commissions.secretary@sfgov.org <commissions.secretary@sfgov.org>; mary.wood@sfgov.org <mary.wood@sfgov.org>
Subject: Opposition to 1950 Page Plans rev 5.1.2020

Dear Commissioners Koppel, Moore, Chan, Diamond, Fung, and Imperial:

I wish to note my concerns about the ambitious expansion plans sought by San Francisco High School of the Arts (School) and the Conditional Use Authorization that these plans would require. No clear information has been provided by the School to substantiate the need for expanding the current building and the need for a planning variance that the expanded building would require. The current enrollment is approximately 50 students, and the School has provided no data that supports the reality of expanding the school's enrollment to 250 students, as they project.

Along with ten of my neighbors, I submitted a letter with concerns to the Planning Department; this letter was also provided to the School. At the most recent community outreach meeting hosted by the School on September 17, the School director, its consulting planner, and its architect were not able to answer many of the specific questions that were raised about the current plans. For example, the architect noted that questions about underground parking and the connection of this parking to the street—which would impact the neighborhood—could not be addressed because no structural engineer has been hired to provide this expertise for the plans. Other issues included the documented need for expansion that is driving this request for a Conditional Use Authorization, parking expansion and street safety, the proposed construction schedule, storage of construction materials and equipment, and the shadow study and impacts. , Technical difficulties that the School experienced around hosting this virtual meeting meant that some individuals who attempted to access this meeting were not able to attend.

The neighborhood will be left with limited recourse to address issues if the School plans are approved as presented. I request that the Planning Commission delay any approval of the Conditional Use Authorization of the School's plan until more detailed information is provided on structural engineering issues and other concerns raised by the neighborhood. The need for expanding the School must be clearly established before this project is approved.

Sincerely,

Denise Bradley
1965 Page Street, No. 202
San Francisco, CA 94117

From: [CPC-Commissions Secretary](#)
Cc: [Feliciano, Josephine \(CPC\)](#); [Woods, Mary \(CPC\)](#)
Subject: FW: 2019-014214DRP - 457 MARIPOSA STREET - Public Comment / Opposition
Date: Thursday, October 08, 2020 9:54:16 AM
Attachments: [image007.png](#)
[image008.png](#)
[image009.png](#)
[image010.png](#)
[image011.png](#)
[image012.png](#)
Importance: High

Commission Affairs

San Francisco Planning Department
49 South Van Ness Avenue, Suite 1400, San Francisco, CA 94103
Direct: 628.652.7600 | www.sfplanning.org
[San Francisco Property Information Map](#)



Due to COVID-19, San Francisco Planning is not providing any in-person services, but we are operating remotely. Our staff are [available by e-mail](#), and the Planning and Historic Preservation Commissions are convening remotely. The public is [encouraged to participate](#). Find more information on our services [here](#).

From: lorie maak <610loriemaak@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, October 08, 2020 9:23 AM
To: CPC-Commissions Secretary <commissions.secretary@sfgov.org>
Subject: 2019-014214DRP - 457 MARIPOSA STREET - Public Comment / Opposition
Importance: High

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

Planning Commission,

Lorie Maak-Ingram, HOA President of the Shipyard Lofts, 610 Illinois Street, writing in opposition to the planned cannabis lounge at 457 Mariposa Street.

I am a long time resident of this neighborhood and a concerned member of the community. My husband and I are owners in the [610 Illinois Street](#) Shipyard Lofts building, which is around the corner from 457 Mariposa, the proposed location for the Barbary Coasts Cannabis Dispensary. Our patio deck is right behind this building.

Presently there is a continuous and substantial odor of cannabis coming from this building. This is of

serious concern to us as we understood cannabis activities were a yet unapproved business at this location. We can smell the odor while on our patio and it invades the comfort of our living space. It is most bothersome. If the owners of this business aren't operating within the legal guidelines now, can we really assume going forward they will act any differently?

We are seriously opposed to the location of such a venue, a cannabis lounge, in this location, especially with another lounge a few blocks away on Pennsylvania.

We did meet up @ 457 Mariposa with the business owners of the proposed lounge many months ago. Their marijuana bar is completely inappropriate given the location diagonally across the street from the UCSF Women and Children's Hospital, a new neighborhood park at Mariposa and Illinois, and the long awaited Crane Cove Park on the waterfront. This park was planned for families enjoying the lawns, waterfront beach, and barbecue facilities. We have waited a very, very long time for these parks in our neighborhood, and now is not the time to occupy these spaces with marijuana smoking outsiders.

We agree with our neighbor Christopher Delaney at 600 Illinois who made the following comments in opposition to this marijuana facility:

1. We were told @ the meeting with the owners that the dispensary will have security staff positioned within 50 feet of the entrance and exit of the establishment. We believe that a visible need for security is a signifier of potential danger. This is not the right message for our community.
2. The owners of the dispensary have identified this location to be advantageous to their business because of the T-Line. They informed us @ our meeting with them several months ago this location was ideal for this type of dispensary for their many customers who would be traveling from outside of the area using public transportation via the T-Line to visit their dispensary.
 1. Do we really want to encourage users to come to our community who have no interest in our welfare as a community? By example, since the introduction of Chase Center when the public passes by... We have had to clean up many, many bottles of beer + soft drinks. This is a HIGHLY TRAFFICKED AREA when Chase Center is functioning.
 2. This is the same T-line which serves
 - A. The hospital community, as well as those visiting patients in the hospital.
 - B. The general public, predominantly families visiting the new Crane Cove waterfront park, their direct path is in front of the armed security guard or guards policing the site to stop dangerous activity. Why should we introduce such a use in our community which requires guards ..where large groups of public park visitors will pass due to the location of the T line stop. Simply put this is not the type of social message we believe is in the best interest of our community.
3. 457 Mariposa is also directly in front of rideshare drop off + pick-ups for Chase Center. This is NOT the actual designated site, however, we have experienced a significant amount of traffic

during ALL events. We do not want our community to be identified as the BAR district on the perimeter of Mission Bay + Chase Center. The dividing line is the Center of Mariposa / Public lands of Mission Bay to the North + Private lands of Dog Patch to the South.

4. This dispensary has also applied for an on-site consumption permit which means that it will introduce people who are high on drugs into our neighborhood. This is not what our community needs or wants.

It is our understanding that there are 2 other applications pending in the Dogpatch Community with this being the 3rd application. There is currently an existing dispensary, Dutchman's Flat, located at [2544 3rd Street](#) which seems to be popular and well-liked by the community. The proposed application @ 457 Mariposa is 4.5 blocks from this existing business. Why do we need another dispensary which is in such close proximity to an existing business...

Our belief is that this business would like to capitalize on the location of 457 being very close to Chase Center + the thousands of folks who will be using their facility in the future + the existence of public transportation as noted previously. This bodes very badly for our community as a service site for recreational drugs + liquor. This is simply not in line with the planning of our community and the aspirations of our community the Dog Patch as a diverse urban community.

We are urging you most vigorously to not approve this location as a new marijuana facility.

Most Sincerely,

Lorie Maak-Ingram and Michael Ingram



Lorie Maak Ingram

415.517.3557

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Pantoja, Gabriela \(CPC\)](#)
To: [Koppel, Joel \(CPC\)](#); [Moore, Kathrin \(CPC\)](#); [Chan, Deland \(CPC\)](#); [Diamond, Susan \(CPC\)](#); [Fung, Frank \(CPC\)](#); [Imperial, Theresa \(CPC\)](#)
Cc: [CTYPLN - COMMISSION SECRETARY](#)
Subject: 123-127 Collingwood St. Record No. 2019-023428CUAVAR
Date: Wednesday, October 07, 2020 7:36:45 PM
Attachments: [123-127 Collingwood St. Occupancy Load Explanation PS.pdf](#)

Hello all,

Attached please find an additional correspondence from the Project Sponsors of the Project at 123-127 Collingwood St. (2019-023428CUAVAR) to be heard at tomorrow's hearing. The Project Sponsors wished to share this correspondence with you all in advance of the hearing.

Thank you,
Gabriela

Gabriela Pantoja, Planner
Southwest Team, Current Planning Division

San Francisco Planning Department

PLEASE NOTE MY NEW ADDRESS AND PHONE NUMBER AS OF AUGUST 17:

49 South Van Ness Avenue, Suite 1400, San Francisco, CA 94103

Direct: 628-652-7380 | www.sfplanning.org

[San Francisco Property Information Map](#)

IN ORDER FOR US TO MOVE, OUR OFFICE WILL BE CLOSED WITH NO ACCESS TO PHONES OR E-MAIL ON THURSDAY, AUGUST 13 and FRIDAY, AUGUST 14. WE APPRECIATE YOUR PATIENCE.

Due to COVID-19, San Francisco Planning is not providing any in-person services, but we are operating remotely. Our staff are [available by e-mail](#), and the Planning and Historic Preservation Commissions are convening remotely. The public is [encouraged to participate](#). Find more information on our services [here](#).

From: [CPC-Commissions Secretary](#)
Cc: [Feliciano, Josephine \(CPC\)](#); [Jardines, Esmeralda \(CPC\)](#)
Subject: FW: 2019-014214DRP - 457 MARIPOSA STREET - Public Comment
Date: Thursday, October 08, 2020 9:53:40 AM
Attachments: [image007.png](#)
[image008.png](#)
[image009.png](#)
[image010.png](#)
[image011.png](#)
[image012.png](#)

Commission Affairs

San Francisco Planning Department
49 South Van Ness Avenue, Suite 1400, San Francisco, CA 94103
Direct: 628.652.7600 | www.sfplanning.org
[San Francisco Property Information Map](#)



Due to COVID-19, San Francisco Planning is not providing any in-person services, but we are operating remotely. Our staff are [available by e-mail](#), and the Planning and Historic Preservation Commissions are convening remotely. The public is [encouraged to participate](#). Find more information on our services [here](#).

From: Topher Delaney <topher@virgiegilesfoundation.org>
Sent: Wednesday, October 07, 2020 7:11 PM
To: CPC-Commissions Secretary <commissions.secretary@sfgov.org>; jdbean46@gmail.com;
610loriemaak@gmail.com; calvin@virgiegilesfoundation.org
Subject: Re: 2019-014214DRP - 457 MARIPOSA STREET - Public Comment

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

Greetings Planning Commission,

Christopher Delaney here. I am a stakeholder and member of the community. I am the owner of 600 Illinois Street which is directly adjacent to 457 Mariposa, the proposed location for the Barbary Coasts Cannabis Dispensary.

We are opposed to the location of such a venue, a Marijuana Dispensary, in our community.

We did meet up @ 457 Mariposa with the business owners of the proposed Dispensary many months ago. They are NOT the owners of the real estate. Their presentation of what amounts to a marijuana bar is, in our view, completely inappropriate given the location diagonally across the street from the UCSF Women + Children's Hospital + our fabulous new neighborhood waterfront

park which has opened to the delight of our communities. The park is a packed house as they say with predominantly families enjoying the lawns, waterfront beach, and barbecue facilities.

Below are our comments about the proposed cannabis dispensary.

1. We were told @ the meeting with the owners that the dispensary will have security staff positioned within 50 feet of the entrance and exit of the establishment. We believe that a visible need for security is a signifier of potential danger. This is not the right message for our community.
2. The owners of the dispensary have identified this location to be advantageous to their business because of the T-Line. They informed us @ our meeting with them several months ago this location was ideal for this type of dispensary for their many customers who would be traveling from outside of the area using public transportation via the T-Line to visit their dispensary.
 1. Do we really want to encourage users to come to our community who have no interest in our welfare as a community? By example, since the introduction of Chase Center when the public passes by... We have had to clean up many many bottles of beer + soft drinks. This is a HIGHLY TRAFFICKED AREA when Chase Center is functioning.
 2. This is the same T-line which serves
 1. The hospital community as well as those visiting patients in the hospital.
 2. The general public, predominantly families visiting the new Crane Cove waterfront park, their direct path is in front of the armed security guard or guards policing the site to stop dangerous activity. Why should we introduce such a use in our community which requires guards ..where large groups of public park visitors will pass due to the location of the T line stop. Simply put this is not the type of social message we believe is in the best interest of our community.
3. 457 Mariposa is also directly in front of rideshare drop off + pick ups for Chase Center. This is NOT the actual designated site, however, we have experienced a significant amount of traffic during ALL events. We do not want our community to be identified as the BAR district on the perimeter of Mission Bay + Chase Center. The dividing line is the Center of Mariposa / Public lands of Mission Bay to the North + Private lands of Dog Patch to the South.
4. This dispensary has also applied for an on-site consumption permit which means that it will introduce people who are high on drugs into our neighborhood. This is not what our community needs or wants.

It is our understanding that there are 2 other applications pending in the Dogpatch Community with this being the 3rd application. There is currently an existing dispensary, Dutchman's Flat, located at 2544 3rd Street which seems to be popular and well liked by the community. The proposed application @ 457 Mariposa is 4.5 blocks from this existing business. Why do we need another dispensary which is in such close proximity to an existing business...

Our belief is that this business would like to capitalize on the location of 457 being very close to Chase Center + the thousands of folks who will be using their facility in the future + the existence of

public transportation as noted previously. This bodes very badly for our community as a service site for recreational drugs + liquor. This is simply not in line with the planning of our community and the aspirations of our community the Dog Patch as a diverse urban community.

~Christopher Delaney



From: [CPC-Commissions Secretary](#)
To: [Feliciano, Josephine \(CPC\)](#)
Subject: FW: Petition requesting commission take DR on 375-377 Hearst Avenue
Date: Thursday, October 08, 2020 9:52:43 AM
Attachments: [Petition_375-377Hearst_Combined.pdf](#)
[image013.png](#)
[image014.png](#)
[image015.png](#)
[image016.png](#)
[image017.png](#)
[image018.png](#)

Commission Affairs

San Francisco Planning Department
49 South Van Ness Avenue, Suite 1400, San Francisco, CA 94103
Direct: 628.652.7600 | www.sfplanning.org
[San Francisco Property Information Map](#)



Due to COVID-19, San Francisco Planning is not providing any in-person services, but we are operating remotely. Our staff are [available by e-mail](#), and the Planning and Historic Preservation Commissions are convening remotely. The public is [encouraged to participate](#). Find more information on our services [here](#).

From: gmckinne@pacbell.net <gmckinne@pacbell.net>
Sent: Wednesday, October 07, 2020 4:21 PM
To: Chan, Deland (CPC) <deland.chan@sfgov.org>; Fung, Frank (CPC) <frank.fung@sfgov.org>; Koppel, Joel (CPC) <joel.koppel@sfgov.org>; Moore, Kathrin (CPC) <kathrin.moore@sfgov.org>; Diamond, Susan (CPC) <sue.diamond@sfgov.org>; Imperial, Theresa (CPC) <theresa.imperial@sfgov.org>
Cc: CPC-Commissions Secretary <commissions.secretary@sfgov.org>; Ionin, Jonas (CPC) <jonas.ionin@sfgov.org>; Winslow, David (CPC) <david.winslow@sfgov.org>; Kathleen Echiverri <yodashops@aol.com>; Lisa Spinali <lisa.spinali@gmail.com>
Subject: Petition requesting commission take DR on 375-377 Hearst Avenue

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

Dear Commissioners,

The below listed San Francisco residents respectfully request that the commission take Discretionary Review of the following problematic project:

Property Address: **375-377 Hearst Ave.**

Assessor's Parcel #: **Block 3120, Lot 036**
Zoning District: **RH-1 – Residential Home, One Family**
Application #: **201907024992**

Our reasons for this request are:

- The planned building is too large and out of character for the neighborhood at more than 4,000 square feet while the neighborhood average is less than 2,000 square feet.
- Designed with numerous “boarding house” features, the planned building is NOT consistent with the single-family nature of the neighborhood.
- The planned building will interrupt the shared mid-block green space by extending into the rear yard 30 feet beyond one neighbor and 40 feet beyond the other.
- Given its imposing size, the new building will block significant sunlight and disrupt air flows negatively impacting nearby properties.
- If built, the new building will set a harmful precedent by setting the stage for future overly large, intrusive, and out of character development in the neighborhood.

We thank the San Francisco Planning Commission for giving thoughtful consideration to our request.

Signed by:

- Jim O’Callaghan
- Teri O’Callaghan
- Ken Hollenbeck
- Kruawan Jee Suthamwamthanee
- Kuan Khurana
- Somchai Sirimontri
- Reina Loli-Yello
- Mike Anderson
- Claudia Solis
- Pat Crocker
- Candice Calhoun
- Monica Collins
- Lisabeth Collins
- Lawrence Streeter
- Mary Alexis Cronin Streeter
- Erica Pfeifer
- Donna Cronin
- Scott Streeter
- Richard Goldman
- Kathleen N. Echiverri
- Brian Arthur Smith
- Mary Jo Schleicher
- Jennifer Clancy
- Renee Espinoza
- Joe Waterman

Gregory Hayes

- Jennifer Cheng
- Parker Trewin
- Barbara Berry
- Lisa Spinali
- Nancy L. McKinney
- Gregory W. McKinney
- Vaughn Korbin
- Estelle Smith
- Warren P. Lubich
- Alycia Chu
- Robin Chu
- Amy O'Hair
- Craig Jacobs
- Sharon Clisham
- Dennis Clisham

Respectfully submitted by
~Gregory McKinney

+++++

Greg McKinney
371 Hearst Ave.
San Francisco, CA USA

gmckinne@pacbell.net

415.713.1289

From: [CPC-Commissions Secretary](#)
Cc: [Feliciano, Josephine \(CPC\)](#); [Woods, Mary \(CPC\)](#)
Subject: FW: 1950 Page St.
Date: Thursday, October 08, 2020 9:52:15 AM
Attachments: [image007.png](#)
[image008.png](#)
[image009.png](#)
[image010.png](#)
[image011.png](#)
[image012.png](#)

Commission Affairs

San Francisco Planning Department
49 South Van Ness Avenue, Suite 1400, San Francisco, CA 94103
Direct: 628.652.7600 | www.sfplanning.org
[San Francisco Property Information Map](#)



Due to COVID-19, San Francisco Planning is not providing any in-person services, but we are operating remotely. Our staff are [available by e-mail](#), and the Planning and Historic Preservation Commissions are convening remotely. The public is [encouraged to participate](#). Find more information on our services [here](#).

From: Michael Milenski <vmmilenski@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, October 07, 2020 3:02 PM
To: CPC-Commissions Secretary <commissions.secretary@sfgov.org>
Subject: 1950 Page St.

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

To whom it may concern:

I am writing regarding the rear wall (that huge, property line cast cement wall that faces the homes on Oak St.). This project proposes raising the western portion of this rear wall by up to 2'. The plans say that it will be stuccoed. I have previously requested that this added height to the wall be in the same material as the rest of this huge concrete wall, and finished to match the existing wall in color (weathered white) and texture (concrete cast in the same sized lumber).

This request was not addressed in the latest plans.

Note as well that it would be possible to re-conceive the proposed addition without increasing the height of this parapet wall and without affecting the actual usable (public) areas of the proposed addition.

Please incorporate this request into any provisional approval that may be granted for this project.

Victor and Ellen Milenski

2049 Oak St., No. 2

San Francisco, CA 94117

415 831 4241

Mailing address: 912 Cole St. #133, SF CA 94117

From: [Ionin, Jonas \(CPC\)](#)
Cc: [Feliciano, Josephine \(CPC\)](#)
Subject: FW: 123-127 Collingwood St. (2019-023428CUAVAR)
Date: Thursday, October 08, 2020 9:28:57 AM
Attachments: [123-127 Collingwood St. Occupancy Load Explanation PS.pdf](#)

Jonas P Ionin
Director of Commission Affairs

San Francisco Planning
49 South Van Ness Avenue, Suite 1400, San Francisco, CA 94103
Direct: 628.652.7589 | www.sfplanning.org
[San Francisco Property Information Map](#)

From: "Pantoja, Gabriela (CPC)" <gabriela.pantoja@sfgov.org>
Date: Wednesday, October 7, 2020 at 5:09 PM
To: CTYPLN - COMMISSION SECRETARY <CPC.COMMISSIONSECRETARY@sfgov.org>
Cc: Delvin Washington <delvin.washington@sfgov.org>
Subject: 123-127 Collingwood St. (2019-023428CUAVAR)

Hi Jonas,

May you please forward the attached letter to the Planning Commissioners. The letter is additional correspondence from the Project Sponsors to the Planning Commissioners for tomorrow's hearing.

Thanks,
Gaby

Gabriela Pantoja, Planner
Southwest Team, Current Planning Division

San Francisco Planning Department

PLEASE NOTE MY NEW ADDRESS AND PHONE NUMBER AS OF AUGUST 17:

49 South Van Ness Avenue, Suite 1400, San Francisco, CA 94103
Direct: 628-652-7380 | www.sfplanning.org
[San Francisco Property Information Map](#)

IN ORDER FOR US TO MOVE, OUR OFFICE WILL BE CLOSED WITH NO ACCESS TO PHONES OR E-MAIL ON THURSDAY, AUGUST 13 and FRIDAY, AUGUST 14. WE APPRECIATE YOUR PATIENCE.

Due to COVID-19, San Francisco Planning is not providing any in-person services, but we are operating remotely. Our staff are [available by e-mail](#), and the Planning and Historic Preservation Commissions are convening remotely. The public is [encouraged to participate](#). Find more information on our services [here](#).

From: [CPC-Commissions Secretary](#)
To: [Feliciano, Josephine \(CPC\)](#)
Subject: FW: Please approve the San Francisco High School of the Arts expansion plans
Date: Wednesday, October 07, 2020 10:46:29 AM
Attachments: [image007.png](#)
[image008.png](#)
[image009.png](#)
[image010.png](#)
[image011.png](#)
[image012.png](#)

Commission Affairs

San Francisco Planning Department
49 South Van Ness Avenue, Suite 1400, San Francisco, CA 94103
Direct: 628.652.7600 | www.sfplanning.org
[San Francisco Property Information Map](#)



Due to COVID-19, San Francisco Planning is not providing any in-person services, but we are operating remotely. Our staff are [available by e-mail](#), and the Planning and Historic Preservation Commissions are convening remotely. The public is [encouraged to participate](#). Find more information on our services [here](#).

From: Ivory Madison <ivorymadison@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, October 07, 2020 10:43 AM
To: Koppel, Joel (CPC) <joel.koppel@sfgov.org>; Moore, Kathrin (CPC) <kathrin.moore@sfgov.org>; Chan, Deland (CPC) <deland.chan@sfgov.org>; Diamond, Susan (CPC) <sue.diamond@sfgov.org>; Fung, Frank (CPC) <frank.fung@sfgov.org>; Imperial, Theresa (CPC) <theresa.imperial@sfgov.org>; Woods, Mary (CPC) <mary.woods@sfgov.org>; CPC-Commissions Secretary <commissions.secretary@sfgov.org>
Subject: Please approve the San Francisco High School of the Arts expansion plans

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

My apologies for leaving you all off my letter to Ms. Woods. Please see below, our letter of support for the expansion up for review by your office. Thank you!

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Ivory Madison** <ivorymadison@gmail.com>
Date: Wed, Oct 7, 2020 at 10:34 AM
Subject: Please approve the San Francisco High School of the Arts expansion plans
To: <Mary.Woods@sfgov.org>
Cc: Abraham Mertens <abrahammertens@gmail.com>

Dear Ms. Woods,

My husband and I are writing to you today to offer our heartfelt support of the proposed expansion by the San Francisco High School of the Arts. It is well-thought out and necessary to reach more families and more children with their outstanding programs. At a time when the arts are being reduced and defunded in the schools and in society, there is a real need in San Francisco for this school, and for the city to facilitate its expansion.

My family has enjoyed the community classes and programs at the San Francisco High School of the Arts for more than seven years. I've been so impressed with their programs, teachers, and their leadership that we have now enrolled our daughter full-time in their Middle School program. We plan to send our son to attend full-time as soon as he is old enough.

This is a school that offers extensive, sometimes 100% scholarships to kids who show a love of the arts. They offer professional-level training to children, taking their dreams seriously. The school fosters kindness and self-discipline in their students. The teachers are incredibly devoted, offering personalized assistance at a level that matches what we have experienced in some of the best schools in San Francisco.

The school even provides buses for public-school children to attend after-school arts and Chinese language classes that help working families and immigrant families have a safe place for their kids after school. It is a place where a family's Chinese interests and/or identity is validated. It also offers non-Chinese families like ours the chance to become more international in our understanding of the arts. Even their math program takes an international perspective.

The school has been an outstanding addition to the neighborhood, bringing cheerful community events (in non-COVID times), beatification of the neighborhood, and friendly families to the panhandle (we walk the 1.6 miles to school when in-person classes are in session).

It is not widely known that the school generously provides free space to other non-profit arts groups serving children, many of whom are no longer able to afford rent in San Francisco! The addition will allow them to help keep even more of these other non-profits afloat.

The proposed addition will bring even more opportunities to the neighborhood, as the more space they have, the more families they can serve on a full-time basis. The expanded capacity the addition will bring means they can offer more scholarships to families with lower incomes, and the more they can offer community programs on the weekends, after-school, and during the summer for both children and adults.

We greatly appreciate your consideration and interest in carefully planning for the right kind of growth and expansion in all of our neighborhoods. I believe this plan fits that description. Our entire school community, the larger arts community, and many people in the neighborhood hope you think so, too.

Best regards,

Ivory Madison & Abraham Mertens
San Francisco, CA

From: [CPC-Commissions Secretary](#)
To: [Feliciano, Josephine \(CPC\)](#)
Subject: FW: 1950 Page Street- October 8 20120 Hearing
Date: Wednesday, October 07, 2020 10:46:18 AM
Attachments: [image013.png](#)
[image014.png](#)
[image015.png](#)
[image016.png](#)
[image017.png](#)
[image018.png](#)
[image019.png](#)

Commission Affairs

San Francisco Planning Department
49 South Van Ness Avenue, Suite 1400, San Francisco, CA 94103
Direct: 628.652.7600 | www.sfplanning.org
[San Francisco Property Information Map](#)



Due to COVID-19, San Francisco Planning is not providing any in-person services, but we are operating remotely. Our staff are [available by e-mail](#), and the Planning and Historic Preservation Commissions are convening remotely. The public is [encouraged to participate](#). Find more information on our services [here](#).

From: Larry Badiner <larry@badinerurbanplanning.com>
Sent: Wednesday, October 07, 2020 10:28 AM
To: Koppel, Joel (CPC) <joel.koppel@sfgov.org>; Moore, Kathrin (CPC) <kathrin.moore@sfgov.org>; Chan, Deland (CPC) <deland.chan@sfgov.org>; Diamond, Susan (CPC) <sue.diamond@sfgov.org>; Fung, Frank (CPC) <frank.fung@sfgov.org>; Imperial, Theresa (CPC) <theresa.imperial@sfgov.org>
Cc: Woods, Mary (CPC) <mary.woods@sfgov.org>; CPC-Commissions Secretary <commissions.secretary@sfgov.org>
Subject: 1950 Page Street- October 8 20120 Hearing

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

Dear Commissioners - I hope you are all well.

Badiner Urban Planning represents the Institute for Arts and Culture which runs the SF High School and Middle School of the Arts. You have my letter in the Commission packet that Mary Woods forwarded to you, but I wanted to take this opportunity to emphasize a few points.

Outreach

The Institute for Arts and Culture has conducted extensive public outreach beyond that required by

the Planning Code:

- January 2016-pre-application meeting.
- February 2017- neighborhood meeting to solicit ideas about the blank wall on the back with 300' radius mailed notice.
- November 2018- open house with 300' radius mailed notice. Private meetings for those who could not attend.
- October 2018- HANC (Haight Ashbury Neighborhood Council) presentation to current and past presidents.
- January 2019- presented at the HANC meeting
- January 2019- Supervisor Brown came and visited our school.
- September 2020 - zoom meeting with neighbors and mailed plans to those who could not access the meeting/discussion with any interested parties.
- Numerous individual conversations with neighbors.
- We have strong support from immediate neighbors, Haight Ashbury Residents and the school community.

Shadows

After hearing neighbor's concerns about increased shadows and privacy, and discussion with SF Planning, the Institute has made accommodations by modifying the plan accordingly. First, we increased the setback of the proposed third floor greatly. The setback of the third floor in the front was moved to the back and increased from 5' to 25 ft to 35 ft. The side setback on the side was increased from 5 ft to 10 ft on each side. Finally, we increased the rear setback of the third-floor roof deck from 12 ft to 45 ft.

Drop-Off and Pick-Up

As is typical of schools, concerns have focused on loading in the existing three space white zone.

- Prior to the Covid epidemic, the white zone was operational from 7:30-9am and 4:00-6:30pm with general parking during the day.
- During Covid, neither the school nor SFMTA is enforcing the white zone so it is available for general parking 24 hours a day. Since the school is providing child care, this has resulted in some minor double parking during this period.
- The loading zone in front of the building is proposed to be extended by five spaces, for a total of 8 spaces and from 7:30 am to 6:30 pm from the current 7:30-8:30 am and 4:30-6:30 pm.
- Some neighbors have expressed concern about the extension of the white zone removing on-street parking, but at the same time expressed concerns about double parking. The extension in length and time is an attempt to address the concerns about double parking.
- There is a robust parking management plan included as part of the environmental review which the school has committed to using. This includes the White Zone Extension, a Schedule Staggering Program, Formalized Drop-off / Pick-up Procedures, Vehicle Queuing Abatement, and a Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Coordinator

Slow Streets

1. We have heard concerns that the child care pick up and drop off is not allowed under the Page Street Slow Streets program. We confirmed with SFMTA that such local access is allowed with the request that cars access the school as close to Shrader and Stanyan Streets as possible. I would also note the article today's Examiner and the SFMTA blog that notes the purpose of Slow Streets is for essential travel. Access to child care is essential travel.

Per the Examiner article:

Some people who live near popular Slow Streets corridors have also reported crowding or use of the roadways for recreation rather than travel, a trend the SFMTA tried to address in [its Monday blog post](#).

“Slow Streets are for essential trips, not neighborhood gathering points,” it read, re-iterating the face mask and social distance mandates.”

<https://www.sfexaminer.com/news/all-approved-slow-streets-to-be-completed-by-octobers-end/>

The SFMTA post:

<https://www.sfmta.com/blog/slow-streets%C2%A0are%C2%A0full-steam-ahead>

Thanks,

Larry



From: [CPC-Commissions Secretary](#)
Cc: [Feliciano, Josephine \(CPC\)](#); [Woods, Mary \(CPC\)](#)
Subject: FW: 1950 Page Street Agenda Item 10.08.2020
Date: Wednesday, October 07, 2020 9:49:07 AM
Attachments: [1950 Page Development IMPERIAL10.2020.pdf](#)
[image013.png](#)
[image014.png](#)
[image015.png](#)
[image016.png](#)
[image017.png](#)
[image018.png](#)

Commission Affairs

San Francisco Planning Department
49 South Van Ness Avenue, Suite 1400, San Francisco, CA 94103
Direct: 628.652.7600 | www.sfplanning.org
[San Francisco Property Information Map](#)



Due to COVID-19, San Francisco Planning is not providing any in-person services, but we are operating remotely. Our staff are [available by e-mail](#), and the Planning and Historic Preservation Commissions are convening remotely. The public is [encouraged to participate](#). Find more information on our services [here](#).

From: Susan Latham <sdlatham@prodigy.net>
Sent: Tuesday, October 06, 2020 6:08 PM
To: CPC-Commissions Secretary <commissions.secretary@sfgov.org>
Subject: 1950 Page Street Agenda Item 10.08.2020

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

I respectfully submit concerns and observations, attached, regarding the plan submitted the Planning Department by Institute for Arts and Culture, 1950 Page Street, San Francisco, CA 94117. The documents under review are 1950 Page Plans rev 5.1.2020, as well as 1950 Page CEQA.

Respectfully,

Susan Latham

1965 Page Street #301
San Francisco, CA 94117

From: [CPC-Commissions Secretary](#)
To: [Feliciano, Josephine \(CPC\)](#)
Subject: FW: 1950 Page - School of the Arts
Date: Wednesday, October 07, 2020 8:28:22 AM
Attachments: [image007.png](#)
[image008.png](#)
[image009.png](#)
[image010.png](#)
[image011.png](#)
[image012.png](#)

Commission Affairs

San Francisco Planning Department
49 South Van Ness Avenue, Suite 1400, San Francisco, CA 94103
Direct: 628.652.7600 | www.sfplanning.org
[San Francisco Property Information Map](#)



Due to COVID-19, San Francisco Planning is not providing any in-person services, but we are operating remotely. Our staff are [available by e-mail](#), and the Planning and Historic Preservation Commissions are convening remotely. The public is [encouraged to participate](#). Find more information on our services [here](#).

From: tesw@aol.com <tesw@aol.com>
Sent: Tuesday, October 06, 2020 5:03 PM
To: Koppel, Joel (CPC) <joel.koppel@sfgov.org>; Moore, Kathrin (CPC) <kathrin.moore@sfgov.org>; Chan, Deland (CPC) <deland.chan@sfgov.org>; Diamond, Susan (CPC) <sue.diamond@sfgov.org>; Fung, Frank (CPC) <frank.fung@sfgov.org>; Imperial, Theresa (CPC) <theresa.imperial@sfgov.org>; Woods, Mary (CPC) <mary.woods@sfgov.org>; CPC-Commissions Secretary <commissions.secretary@sfgov.org>
Subject: 1950 Page - School of the Arts

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

Dear Commissioners:

I am troubled by the ambitious expansion sought by San Francisco High School of the Arts [current name], and the unprofessional manner with which it represents itself. The projected plans have changed over time, adding additional square footage and increasing student enrollment. Public presentations have been ill-prepared to the point that neither the architect nor the sponsor's planner could answer basic questions about engineering plans.

I live on the same square block as the school. Community outreach has been

substandard, the most recent Google Meet suffering long delays, with a few dozen people being unable to log on at all. Only about four slides were shown. Before-and-after illustrations of a shadow study were of unlabeled different scales.

Clear plans for construction are important to neighbors. Plans now are vague. The on-site SRO-style housing, said to be for instructors, is puzzling. There have been no discussions about noise abatement and HVAC placement.

I am bothered by the proposed elimination of five more parking spots beyond those already negotiated with neighbors and the SFMTA. Despite assurances over the years that school traffic will flow smoothly utilizing a human monitor, the street is now regularly blocked in the afternoon by the double-parked cars of parents, and no monitor in sight. And this is with only a few dozen students now attending on-site. We cannot imagine the situation if a projected 250 students enroll. Page Street is a bicycle shared street, and currently, Page Street is a city-designated Slow Street. A traffic management plan with teeth is needed.

Given the school's lack of transparency and concern for neighbors, questions of justification for expansion without meaningful data or projections, sloppy public presentations, and haphazard outreach to the community, we hope the Planning Commission will take a hard look at this project. The motives and efficacy of this school as business enterprise and educational institution must be clearly established before this project is approved.

Sincerely,
Tes Welborn

From: [CPC-Commissions Secretary](#)
Cc: [Feliciano, Josephine \(CPC\)](#); [Woods, Mary \(CPC\)](#)
Subject: FW: Opposition to 1950 Page plans
Date: Wednesday, October 07, 2020 8:28:14 AM
Attachments: [image007.png](#)
[image008.png](#)
[image009.png](#)
[image010.png](#)
[image011.png](#)
[image012.png](#)

Commission Affairs

San Francisco Planning Department
49 South Van Ness Avenue, Suite 1400, San Francisco, CA 94103
Direct: 628.652.7600 | www.sfplanning.org
[San Francisco Property Information Map](#)



Due to COVID-19, San Francisco Planning is not providing any in-person services, but we are operating remotely. Our staff are [available by e-mail](#), and the Planning and Historic Preservation Commissions are convening remotely. The public is [encouraged to participate](#). Find more information on our services [here](#).

From: Carl Russo <c_russo@hotmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, October 06, 2020 2:44 PM
To: CPC-Commissions Secretary <commissions.secretary@sfgov.org>
Subject: Opposition to 1950 Page plans

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

Commission Affairs

San Francisco Planning Department
49 South Van Ness Avenue, Suite 1400
San Francisco, CA 94103

CC: Planning Department Commissioners

Response to 1950 Page Plans rev 5.1.2020

October 6, 2020

Dear Commissioner:

We are troubled by the ambitious expansion sought by San Francisco High School of the Arts, and the unprofessional manner with which it represents itself. The projected plans have changed over time, adding additional square footage and increasing student enrollment. Public presentations have been ill-prepared to the point that neither the architect nor the planner could answer basic questions about engineering plans.

Community outreach has been substandard, the most recent Google Meet suffering long delays, with a few dozen people being unable to log on at all. Before-and-after illustrations of a shadow study were of different scales, with no one able to tell us which time of year they represented.

Plans for construction remain worrying based on experience with the school. A large volunteer force of this religious sect's members makes the property a busy hive of activity. Are they qualified tradespeople? Are building codes being adhered to? There is no apparent oversight at this point. One night around 10 p.m., I had to send the police because workers were noisily drilling through concrete. Nothing has been stated about materials storage nor whether a crane will be brought into the neighborhood.

Precious little has been said about the resident apartments to be built, purportedly for staff, except that they will lack kitchens. Neither have detailed discussions about noise abatement and HVAC placement occurred.

Neighbors are given a verbal guarantee that no power tools will be used on Saturdays and no construction at all on Sundays. This was already flouted just a few weekends ago with loud drilling or sawing emanating from within the walls over a Saturday and Sunday. After complaining, I was told by the school head that some sort of emergency required fixing. Maybe so, but such an excuse could easily become license to do construction at any time.

The elimination of five more parking spots are requested to expand the school's loading zone, which was already negotiated with neighbors and the SFMTA. Despite assurances over the years that school traffic will flow smoothly utilizing a human monitor, the street is now regularly blocked in the afternoon by the double-parked cars of parents, and no monitor in sight. And this is with only some dozens of students now attending on-site. We cannot imagine the situation if a projected 250 students enroll.

Currently, Page Street is a city-designated Slow Street, and the school has become a hazard for pedestrians and cyclists allowed full use of traffic lanes. Under normal conditions, the 1900 block of Page gridlocks at rush hour, during events in Golden Gate Park and Kezar Stadium, with tourist traffic in the summer and big rig deliveries to Whole Foods. Many neighbors remember the reckless automotive free-for-all when 1950 Page was occupied by a poorly managed Boys and Girls Club. Déjà vu is setting in.

Given the school's lack of transparency and concern for neighbors, questions of justification for the expansion without meaningful data or projections, sloppy public presentations, and haphazard outreach to the community, we hope the Planning Commission will take a hard look at this project. The motives and efficacy of this school as business enterprise and educational institution must be clearly established before this project is approved.

Sincerely,

Carl Russo and Vanessa Picton

1965 Page Street, Apt. 303

San Francisco, CA 94117

From: [CPC-Commissions Secretary](#)
Cc: [Feliciano, Josephine \(CPC\)](#); [Woods, Mary \(CPC\)](#)
Subject: FW: 1950 Page Street development protest by the owners and residents of 1922 & 1928 Page Street
Date: Tuesday, October 06, 2020 2:34:19 PM
Attachments: [image007.png](#)
[image008.png](#)
[image009.png](#)
[image010.png](#)
[image011.png](#)
[image012.png](#)

Commission Affairs

San Francisco Planning Department
49 South Van Ness Avenue, Suite 1400, San Francisco, CA 94103
Direct: 628.652.7600 | www.sfplanning.org
[San Francisco Property Information Map](#)



Due to COVID-19, San Francisco Planning is not providing any in-person services, but we are operating remotely. Our staff are [available by e-mail](#), and the Planning and Historic Preservation Commissions are convening remotely. The public is [encouraged to participate](#). Find more information on our services [here](#).

From: Katharine Lange <katharinelange@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, October 06, 2020 1:45 PM
To: CPC-Commissions Secretary <commissions.secretary@sfgov.org>
Subject: 1950 Page Street development protest by the owners and residents of 1922 & 1928 Page Street

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

I am writing to protest the proposed development of 1950 Page Street. I am a resident and my family is the owner of 1922 Page Street and I am writing on behalf of the other two story single family house 1928 Page street owned by Ruth Dorsey.

The new proposal submitted for 1950 Page street would change the community and residential aspects of this block of Page street. The proposed building with its height increased from 2 to 3 stories on Page Street and 4 stories at the rear would dominate the city block and destroy the community of the surrounding homes. This massive structure would block the sunlight for the city block to everything on the east and northern sides of this proposed building.

In addition, changing this from a school to school with live in facilities would also change the nature of the residents and adversely affect the rest of the homes and families in the

surrounding area increasing the traffic and number of non residents accessing this residential block of the city.

Both of our two houses are to the east of this proposed building and are 2 story single family dwellings. The new proposed building would change the nature of the north side of the street for the 1900 block of Page street dwarfing the single family houses and creating a massive commercial building within this residential neighborhood.

The new proposed building would have an extreme impact on both the light and privacy to adjacent properties on the east side of 1950 Page Street. The proposed windows on the east side of the building would look directly into our bedrooms and the new proposed change in height would completely block all sunlight to both of our homes and gardens.

The depth of this building is also incompatible with the depth of the existing properties to the east side of the proposed building.

In addition, the scale and the design of this proposed building is incompatible with the height and depth of surrounding buildings. It is completely out of character with this two story residential block of the neighborhood. This new proposed building would stand out as if someone had dropped a huge commercial hospital in the middle of our residential block with its design and scale. I think it was inaccurate to mention commercial areas in their proposal like Saint Mary's which is across the panhandle of the park and nearly a mile away and in a completely different neighborhood from the proposed development. The developers are trying to misrepresent this residential block of the neighborhood as something that it is not and characterize it as more commercial when it is the only commercial/non residential building on the block.

Sincerely,

The owners and residents of 1922 & 1928 Page Street

1922 Page Street

Katharine Lange

Kathe Lange

Benjamin Lange

1928 Page Street

Ruth Dorsey

Sam Dorsey

From: [CPC-Commissions Secretary](#)
Cc: [Feliciano, Josephine \(CPC\)](#); [Woods, Mary \(CPC\)](#); [Wietgreffe, Wade \(CPC\)](#)
Subject: FW: Letter from Neighbors of SF School of the Arts
Date: Tuesday, October 06, 2020 2:33:43 PM
Attachments: [image007.png](#)
[image008.png](#)
[image009.png](#)
[image010.png](#)
[image011.png](#)
[image012.png](#)

Commission Affairs

San Francisco Planning Department
49 South Van Ness Avenue, Suite 1400, San Francisco, CA 94103
Direct: 628.652.7600 | www.sfplanning.org
[San Francisco Property Information Map](#)



Due to COVID-19, San Francisco Planning is not providing any in-person services, but we are operating remotely. Our staff are [available by e-mail](#), and the Planning and Historic Preservation Commissions are convening remotely. The public is [encouraged to participate](#). Find more information on our services [here](#).

From: Carl Russo <c_russo@hotmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, October 06, 2020 12:41 PM
To: CPC-Commissions Secretary <commissions.secretary@sfgov.org>
Subject: Letter from Neighbors of SF School of the Arts

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

October 5, 2020

Joel Koppel, President

San Francisco Planning Department
49 South Van Ness Avenue, Suite 1400
San Francisco, CA 94103

CC:

Kathrin Moore, Vice President
Deland Chan
Sue Diamond
Frank S. Fung
Theresa Imperial
Commission Affairs

Dear Mr. Koppel:

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to the CEQA and 1950 Page Street Plans of the San Francisco High School of the Arts, formerly called the Xian Yun Academy. As neighbors, we have significant concerns about the major expansion of the school as proposed. We've shared these concerns with Supervisor Dean Preston, the Haight Ashbury Neighborhood Council, members of the Planning Commission as well as the school's spokesperson.

The High School of the Arts' Planning Application released several months ago contains some notable differences in projected student population, square footage, and parking requests from the initial 2018 proposal.

Projected Student Population/planning documents

2018: "The Xian Yun Academy currently has 43 students enrolled."

2020: "The scope includes an "increase in the current student enrollment to 250 in five years."

Unlike other area private schools, the High School of the Arts provides no published data about enrollment. Last year, there appeared to be a minimal number of students enrolled, equal to the current enrollment numbers indicated in the 2018 plans. The existing structure, with the upgrades to the façade and the internal space, would sufficiently serve the capacity of students currently attending. The rationale for this expansion does not match the consistently low enrollment numbers since the school began five years ago.

Increased square footage

2018: "The proposal would add a third floor and an additional 17,000 square feet to the existing building."

2020: The "Gross Floor Area Calculation" table includes these measurements:
Existing Non-Residential: 31,126 sq ft. Proposed Non-Residential and Residential Group Housing: 54,666 sq. ft.

The new proposal adds 23,540 sq. ft. instead of 17,000 sq. ft.

Parking Spaces and Underground Garage

The project proposes seven additional underground parking spaces **and** an additional 5 parking space aboveground. The school has already received white color-curb parking which was negotiated with the community and approved by SFMTA. The need for additional white space parking and the reduction of neighborhood parking spaces has not been properly explained.

Location and Environmental Concerns

No plan has been provided to address traffic issues caused by parent pickups and drop-offs which result in double-parking. Last year, this created gridlock in the morning and evening even for the minimal number of enrolled students. The 1900 block of Page Street is already impacted by Whole Foods and other community events.

Construction

We respectfully request that the school abides by its verbal promise to limit construction hours to weekdays and Saturdays, with no power tools used on Saturday and no construction of any kind on Sunday. We also request that these hours be limited from 7am to 5pm, rather than announced plans to conclude by 7pm. Additionally, noise abatement (including rooftop HVAC placement for example) still needs to be addressed.

Overall Neighborhood Impact

The lack of transparency has been considerable in a project as extensive as this one. The school did hold a Google Meet on September 18 with the head of school, architect and planner present, but severe technical difficulties caused long delays and prevented numerous people from logging on. Furthermore, lackluster details were given and neither architect nor planner could answer several key questions.

Thus far, school leadership has fielded questions but has been unable to clearly address community concerns. It would be helpful to receive a response, in writing, that addresses our unanswered concerns.

We would be pleased to submit our questions to the school and cc: the Planning Commission as well.

Sincerely,

Denise Bradley

1965 Page Street #202
San Francisco, CA 94117

Angela De Cenzo

636 Stanyan Street
San Francisco, CA 94117

Holly Edson

1937 Page Street
San Francisco, CA 94117

Sherry Hugi

1937 Page Street #5
San Francisco, CA 94117

Susan Latham

1965 Page Street #301
San Francisco, CA 94117

Lisa Lightman

1965 Page Street #302
San Francisco, CA 94117

Vanessa Picton

1965 Page Street #303
San Francisco, CA 94117

Carl Russo

1965 Page Street #303
San Francisco, CA 94117

Tes Welborn

2001 Oak Street
San Francisco, CA 94117

Bruce Wolfe

1951 Page Street
San Francisco, CA 94117

From: [Ionin, Jonas \(CPC\)](#)
Cc: [Feliciano, Josephine \(CPC\)](#)
Subject: FW: please forward to the Planning Commissioners
Date: Monday, October 05, 2020 5:42:53 PM
Attachments: [DRP02 - 375-377 Hearst Avenue.pdf](#)

Jonas P. Ionin,
Director of Commission Affairs

San Francisco Planning
49 South Van Ness Avenue, Suite 1400
San Francisco, CA 94103
(628) 652-7589 | www.sfplanning.org
[San Francisco Property Information Map](#)

Due to COVID-19, the Department is not providing any in-person services, but we are operating remotely. Our staff are [available via e-mail](#), and the Commissions are convening remotely. Find more information on our services [here](#).

From: "Winslow, David (CPC)" <david.winslow@sfgov.org>
Date: Monday, October 5, 2020 at 5:18 PM
To: "Ionin, Jonas (CPC)" <jonas.ionin@sfgov.org>
Subject: please forward to the Planning Commissioners

Jonas,

I had neglected to include this DR application in the packets for 375-377 Hearst- a Discretionary Review for consideration this Thursday.

David Winslow
Principal Architect
Design Review | Citywide and Current Planning
San Francisco Planning Department
49 South Van Ness, Suite 1400 | San Francisco, California, 94103
T: (628) 652-7335

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: [Ionin, Jonas \(CPC\)](#)
Cc: [Feliciano, Josephine \(CPC\)](#)
Subject: FW: *** PRESS RELEASE *** MAYOR LONDON BREED NOMINATES MANNY YEKUTIEL TO SERVE ON THE SAN FRANCISCO MUNICIPAL TRANSPORTATION AGENCY BOARD OF DIRECTORS
Date: Monday, October 05, 2020 11:05:59 AM
Attachments: [10.05.20 SFMTA Board of Directors Nomination Manny Yekutiel.pdf](#)

Jonas P. Ionin,
Director of Commission Affairs

San Francisco Planning
49 South Van Ness Avenue, Suite 1400
San Francisco, CA 94103
(628) 652-7589 | www.sfplanning.org
[San Francisco Property Information Map](#)

Due to COVID-19, the Department is not providing any in-person services, but we are operating remotely. Our staff are [available via e-mail](#), and the Commissions are convening remotely. Find more information on our services [here](#).

From: "Press Office, Mayor (MYR)" <mayorspressoffice@sfgov.org>
Date: Monday, October 5, 2020 at 10:55 AM
To: "Press Office, Mayor (MYR)" <mayorspressoffice@sfgov.org>
Subject: *** PRESS RELEASE *** MAYOR LONDON BREED NOMINATES MANNY YEKUTIEL TO SERVE ON THE SAN FRANCISCO MUNICIPAL TRANSPORTATION AGENCY BOARD OF DIRECTORS

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE:

Monday, October 5, 2020

Contact: Mayor's Office of Communications, mayorspressoffice@sfgov.org

***** PRESS RELEASE *****

**MAYOR LONDON BREED NOMINATES MANNY YEKUTIEL
TO SERVE ON THE SAN FRANCISCO MUNICIPAL
TRANSPORTATION AGENCY BOARD OF DIRECTORS**

*Yekutiel is a current Small Business Commissioner who owns a restaurant, café, bookshop,
and civic gathering space in the Mission District*

San Francisco, CA — Mayor London N. Breed today announced that she is nominating Manny Yekutiel to serve on the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) Board of Directors. Yekutiel is the owner of Manny's, a civic gathering space featuring a cafe, restaurant, and bookshop in the Mission District. He currently serves on the San Francisco Small Business Commission and is a board member of the Valencia Corridor Merchants Association.

"I'm excited and proud to nominate Manny to serve on the SFMTA Board of Directors," said

Mayor Breed. “I am confident in his ability to bring a fresh perspective to the Board and represent the needs of San Francisco small businesses and residents alike. Manny knows how to bring people together and make sure everyone has a chance to share their diverse perspectives. He’s a regular rider of public transportation in our City, and understands how critical Muni is to everyone in our City, especially our workers. In response to COVID, Manny has played a huge role in transforming Valencia Street into a space that supports our residents and helps businesses thrive, and I know he will bring that same energy and commitment to the Board.”

“I am deeply humbled and honored to be considered to serve the City I love as a member of the board of the SFMTA,” said Manny Yekutiel. “Mobility is freedom and it’s my belief that a City like ours should aim to create access to that freedom to everyone, everywhere. Our transportation system can and should do that. The relationship between our transport system, streets, workers, and small businesses has never been more important. I’ve seen first-hand how decisions made by the SFMTA, in the case of temporarily closing streets to cars, has given small businesses a fighting chance to survive this crisis. If given the opportunity to serve, I promise to be a fierce advocate for all San Franciscans and will bring my perspective and my passion as a small business owner to the Board.”

Manny’s is known for its civic events space and engaging conversations on a range of topics. Manny’s is also a restaurant whose kitchen is run by the non-profit, Farming Hope, which hires formerly homeless and formerly incarcerated individuals and trains them in the food skills needed to work in the restaurant industry. As part of Manny’s programming, Yekutiel has hosted public forums across a broad range of issues including recent conversation on COVID-19, racial justice, climate change, and transportation. He has interviewed SFMTA Director Jeff Tumlin about transportation in San Francisco, facilitated a Cycling Town Hall, and has hosted conversations on congestion pricing with the San Francisco County Transportation Authority.

The Valencia Corridor Merchants Association worked with the City to close Valencia Street as part of the Shared Spaces program, an initiative created by Mayor Breed to help neighborhood businesses to share a portion of the public right-of-way for outdoor dining and other neighborhood retail activity. Manny also served on the SFMTA 16th Street Bus Improvement Project Mitigation Task Force.

“Manny would finally be the fierce advocate small businesses need to represent us on the board of the SFMTA,” said William Ortiz-Cartagena, Small Business Commissioner. “Not only does he see things from a small business owner perspective being a small business owner himself, everything Manny does and lives is through a lens of equity.”

“Manny is an extraordinary leader who understands the importance of working within the community, for the community,” said Gina Fromer, CEO of Children’s Council of San Francisco. “He is someone who breaks down barriers for the greater good of San Francisco by bringing all of the various micro-communities together to think critically about the state of the city and beyond.”

Yekutiel was raised in Los Angeles. He comes from a long line of small business owners; his grandparents owned a grocery store in Brooklyn and his father, who emigrated from Afghanistan, had a small business in Southern California selling tablecloths. Yekutiel is a graduate of Williams College, and was a public engagement intern focusing on the LGBTQ and Tribal communities under the Obama Administration. He currently lives in the Castro

District in San Francisco.

###

From: [CPC-Commissions Secretary](#)
To: [Feliciano, Josephine \(CPC\)](#)
Subject: FW: "How do You Solve a Problem like the Demo Calcs?"
Date: Monday, October 05, 2020 8:45:43 AM
Attachments: [A Problem Like Maria.pdf](#)
[image013.png](#)
[image014.png](#)
[image015.png](#)
[image016.png](#)
[image017.png](#)
[image018.png](#)

Commission Affairs

San Francisco Planning Department
49 South Van Ness Avenue, Suite 1400, San Francisco, CA 94103
Direct: 628.652.7600 | www.sfplanning.org
[San Francisco Property Information Map](#)



Due to COVID-19, San Francisco Planning is not providing any in-person services, but we are operating remotely. Our staff are [available by e-mail](#), and the Planning and Historic Preservation Commissions are convening remotely. The public is [encouraged to participate](#). Find more information on our services [here](#).

From: Thomas Schuttish <schuttishtr@sbcglobal.net>

Sent: Saturday, October 03, 2020 6:12 PM

To: Koppel, Joel (CPC) <joel.koppel@sfgov.org>; Kathrin Moore <mooreurban@aol.com>; Fung, Frank (CPC) <frank.fung@sfgov.org>; Imperial, Theresa (CPC) <theresa.imperial@sfgov.org>; Chan, Deland (CPC) <deland.chan@sfgov.org>; Diamond, Susan (CPC) <sue.diamond@sfgov.org>; Ionin, Jonas (CPC) <jonas.ionin@sfgov.org>; CPC-Commissions Secretary <commissions.secretary@sfgov.org>

Cc: Hillis, Rich (CPC) <rich.hillis@sfgov.org>; Watty, Elizabeth (CPC) <elizabeth.watty@sfgov.org>; Merlone, Audrey (CPC) <audrey.merlone@sfgov.org>; Teague, Corey (CPC) <corey.teague@sfgov.org>; Sanchez, Scott (CPC) <scott.sanchez@sfgov.org>; Starr, Aaron (CPC) <aaron.starr@sfgov.org>; Rodgers, AnMarie (CPC) <anmarie.rodgers@sfgov.org>; Winslow, David (CPC) <david.winslow@sfgov.org>; Washington, Delvin (CPC) <delvin.washington@sfgov.org>; Hicks, Bridget (CPC) <Bridget.Hicks@sfgov.org>; Horn, Jeffrey (CPC) <jeffrey.horn@sfgov.org>; Pantoja, Gabriela (CPC) <gabriela.pantoja@sfgov.org>; Cisneros, Stephanie (CPC) <stephanie.cisneros@sfgov.org>; Tam, Tina (CPC) <tina.tam@sfgov.org>; Campbell, Cathleen (CPC) <cathleen.campbell@sfgov.org>; Balba, Ryan (CPC) <ryan.balba@sfgov.org>; Speirs, Jeffrey (CPC) <jeffrey.speirs@sfgov.org>; Lindsay, Ashley (CPC) <ashley.lindsay@sfgov.org>; Fahey, Carolyn (CPC) <carolyn.fahey@sfgov.org>

Subject: "How do You Solve a Problem like the Demo Calcs?"

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

Dear Commissioners:

With apologies to the great lyricist, Oscar Hammerstein, I am adapting the title of the song “How Do you Solve a Problem Like Maria” from “The Sound of Music” for the subject line of this email to you all (including Planners for the SW Quadrant).

I have attached several items in a pdf.

First is the official transcript from the CPC Minutes in early 2016 of Commissioner Richards discussing the fact that the Staff needed more training regarding the Demo Calcs.

Second is a recent Letter from Staff to a project sponsor warning about the Calcs of the project followed by two Plan Sheets for the project with a 2020 version and a 2019 version of the Calcs. (I found this letter on the SFPIM)

Third are Calcs for another project a block away from the "warned project", on the same street where there have been similar projects with "squishy" Calcs over the past few years.

Fourth are the Calcs for an approved project from 2019 where the entitlement is now for sale. I sent an email about this last week to the three Commissioners (and former Commissioner Hillis) who were on the Commission in August 2019.

Fifth are the Calcs for a project that has recently come onto the market selling at \$9.1 million which I emailed and spoke about during the Summer to everyone.

I think it is fair to say that all these projects are Spec Projects, that skirt the rules of the Demo Calcs and spiral upwards the cost of housing in Noe Valley and likely ripple out to other nearby neighborhoods in the SW Quadrant and beyond.

Here are my comments about the attachments.

1. I appreciated Commissioner Richards’ diligence in pursuing the Alteration versus Demolition issue starting back in 2015. In fact the Staff did come up with a new Training Manual in 2015 and 2016 and I appreciate that as well. The Staff also attempted to solve the problem legislatively with the RET, but that was knee-capped as was the Peskin legislation, which was all very unfortunate, but in retrospect not very surprising.
2. Even recently the Staff has refined and revised how the Calcs are reviewed per the CID dated June 2020.
3. I don’t think the Staff should have to write a letter, like the one attached, to a Project Sponsor warning about the Calcs being too close to the threshold....however I am glad that it was written. It was the right thing to do. But I also think letters just like this, could have been written to the other Project Sponsors, of the other attachments, as well as many, many other Project Sponsors over the past six years+.
4. Per Section 317 (b) (2) (D), the Calcs should have been adjusted at least once and probably twice since Section 317 was added to the Code. Why? Well, because it was put into the Code to deal with the issue of extreme Alterations that have the same outcome as Demolitions.
5. Originally when Section 317 was being drafted, the Staff wanted Demo Calcs that were similar to the Calcs under Section 1005(f) but not as strict.
6. That did not happen....but Section 317 allowed for the Commission to adjust the Calcs to achieve policy efficacy.
7. Adjusting the Calcs, to achieve policy efficacy, to preserve relative affordability, to preserve

financial accessibility is a way to solve "the problem".

8. Here is the actual language in Section 317 (b) (2) (D): *"The Planning Commission may reduce the above numerical elements of the criteria in Subsections (b) (2) (B) and (b) (2) (C) by up to 20% of their values should it deem that adjustment is necessary to implement the intent of this Section 317 to conserve existing sound housing and preserve affordable housing."*

Thanks and take good care and be well and safe.

Sincerely,

Georgia Schuttish

From: [CPC-Commissions Secretary](#)
To: [Feliciano, Josephine \(CPC\)](#); [Cisneros, Stephanie \(CPC\)](#)
Subject: FW: 655 5th Avenue - Notice of pre-application meeting
Date: Monday, October 05, 2020 8:45:25 AM
Attachments: [image007.png](#)
[image008.png](#)
[image009.png](#)
[image010.png](#)
[image011.png](#)
[image012.png](#)

Commission Affairs

San Francisco Planning Department
49 South Van Ness Avenue, Suite 1400, San Francisco, CA 94103
Direct: 628.652.7600 | www.sfplanning.org
[San Francisco Property Information Map](#)



Due to COVID-19, San Francisco Planning is not providing any in-person services, but we are operating remotely. Our staff are [available by e-mail](#), and the Planning and Historic Preservation Commissions are convening remotely. The public is [encouraged to participate](#). Find more information on our services [here](#).

From: gumby5@att.net <gumby5@att.net>
Sent: Saturday, October 03, 2020 5:44 PM
To: 'Javier Solorzano' <javier131064@yahoo.com>
Cc: Hillis, Rich (CPC) <rich.hillis@sfgov.org>; CPC-Commissions Secretary <commissions.secretary@sfgov.org>; Chan, Deland (CPC) <deland.chan@sfgov.org>; Fung, Frank (CPC) <frank.fung@sfgov.org>; Koppel, Joel (CPC) <joel.koppel@sfgov.org>; Moore, Kathrin (CPC) <kathrin.moore@sfgov.org>; Diamond, Susan (CPC) <sue.diamond@sfgov.org>; Imperial, Theresa (CPC) <theresa.imperial@sfgov.org>
Subject: RE: 655 5th Avenue - Notice of pre-application meeting

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

Mr. Solorzano:

OK, thx for a copy of the reverse for the 655 5th Ave Pre-app Notice. It would be clearer in future to have ***BOTH*** sides of the Pre-app Notice ***with*** relevant dial-in / virtual meeting access info in the pdf from the get-go, IMHO.

It is only Pre-app Notices from you that do not contain the phone number or virtual info for the meetings on the Pre-App Form.

All other project sponsors are able to include the telephone # / virtual meeting access

info in the "Meeting Address" space on the form at the start.

The only person I've received Pre-app Notices WITHOUT dial in or virtual access information is from you.

I have received the following from you – ***all*** of which never had the telephone dial-in # on the form or virtual meeting info on the form.

1. 85 21st Ave (5/11/2020)
2. 18 Palm (5/12/2020)
3. 2450 Francisco (8/10/2020)
4. 655 5th Ave (10/3/2020)

All other project sponsors have been able to provide the relevant call-in/access information for Pre-app meetings per Planning's COVID-19 procedures. When the information is put on the Pre-app Notice from the start, there will not be such "confusion".

- That is why I copied in my initial email to you the **PLANNING DEPARTMENT/ COMMISSION** for clarification as to process/procedure if anything has changed.

What exactly are Planning's specific directions to have on the Pre-app Notices from the get-go???

Rose

From: Javier Solorzano <javier131064@yahoo.com>
Sent: Saturday, October 3, 2020 5:13 PM
To: :) <gumby5@att.net>
Subject: Re: 655 5th Avenue - Notice of pre-application meeting

Yes, that was for the physical notices that were sent out that was the case. For emails I added the pre-amble that you see in the body of the email itself. My apologies for the confusion.

Javier Solorzano

On Oct 3, 2020, at 4:54 PM, :) <gumby5@att.net> wrote:

TO: Mr. Solorzano:

Thx for the plan drawings pdf & the 1st page of the "Pre-Application Meeting Notice" (Pre-app) for 655 5th Avenue.

In the area for "meeting address," your main page (Page 1) of your Pre-app states, "SEE REVERSE OF THIS NOTICE"

However, the REVERSE (Page 2) is ***missing*** from your Pre-app pdf.

Due to COVID-19 precautions, Pre-app meetings are now held virtually via ZOOM, etc. or via telephone with information for participants to access.

<image001.jpg>

To ensure everyone has the ability to participate if they want to, it might be needed to redistribute to the mailing list the “reverse” (2nd page) of your “Pre-app Notice”.

It should contain the virtual or telephone meeting access information for the meeting you plan to hold ***over the telephone*** on **October 15, 2020, 6-7PM.**

Perhaps u are working on the telephone number, but it should have been in the Pre-app Notice as that’s what others have done prior to sending.

If today’s email is to fulfill the 10-day notification period, with all the information to participate in the meeting, please send to the distribution list again.

Thank you for your attention to this matter. I have not had prior Pre-app Notices with missing virtual meeting or telephone meeting information so I ask.

TO: Planning Department / Commission

If your notification requirements and/or information needed for the public to engage has changed, please advise.

Thank you very much.
Rose

From: Javier Solorzano <javiersolorzano@icloud.com>

Sent: Saturday, October 3, 2020 3:38 PM

To: Dad <javier131064@yahoo.com>

Subject: 655 5th Avenue - Notice of pre-application meeting

Attention,

Due to the shelter in place order, we will hold an over the phone meeting I will be managing the phone call for one hour from 6:00pm-7:00pm on October 15th, 2020. You are encouraged to send an email in advance with any comments or concerns. Please see the attached notice and plans for more details.

Thank you,
Javier Solorzano
415-724-5240
javier131064@yahoo.com

<Notice of pre-application meeting - 655 5th Ave.pdf>

From: [Ionin, Jonas \(CPC\)](#)
Cc: [CTYPLN - COMMISSION SECRETARY](#); [CTYPLN - SENIOR MANAGERS](#); [STACY, KATE \(CAT\)](#); [JENSEN, KRISTEN \(CAT\)](#); [YANG, AUSTIN \(CAT\)](#)
Subject: CPC Calendars for October 8, 2020
Date: Friday, October 02, 2020 4:38:22 PM
Attachments: [20201008_cal.docx](#)
[20201008_cal.pdf](#)
[CPC Hearing Results 2020.docx](#)
[Advance Calendar - 20201008.xlsx](#)

Commissioners,
Attached are your Calendars for October 8, 2020.

Cheers,

Jonas P. Ionin,
Director of Commission Affairs

San Francisco Planning
49 South Van Ness Avenue, Suite 1400
San Francisco, CA 94103
(628) 652-7589 | www.sfplanning.org
[San Francisco Property Information Map](#)

Due to COVID-19, the Department is not providing any in-person services, but we are operating remotely. Our staff are [available via e-mail](#), and the Commissions are convening remotely. Find more information on our services [here](#).

From: [Ionin, Jonas \(CPC\)](#)
Cc: [Feliciano, Josephine \(CPC\)](#)
Subject: FW: *** STATEMENT *** MAYOR LONDON BREED ON BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEARS 2020-21 and 2021-22
Date: Friday, October 02, 2020 4:33:18 PM
Attachments: [10.02.20 FY 2020-21 and 2021-22 Budget.pdf](#)

Jonas P. Ionin,
Director of Commission Affairs

San Francisco Planning
49 South Van Ness Avenue, Suite 1400
San Francisco, CA 94103
(628) 652-7589 | www.sfplanning.org
[San Francisco Property Information Map](#)

Due to COVID-19, the Department is not providing any in-person services, but we are operating remotely. Our staff are [available via e-mail](#), and the Commissions are convening remotely. Find more information on our services [here](#).

From: "Press Office, Mayor (MYR)" <mayorspressoffice@sfgov.org>
Date: Friday, October 2, 2020 at 12:15 PM
To: "Press Office, Mayor (MYR)" <mayorspressoffice@sfgov.org>
Subject: *** STATEMENT *** MAYOR LONDON BREED ON BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEARS 2020-21 and 2021-22

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE:

Friday, October 2, 2020

Contact: Mayor's Office of Communications, mayorspressoffice@sfgov.org

***** STATEMENT *****

**MAYOR LONDON BREED ON BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEARS
2020-21 AND 2021-22**

San Francisco, CA — Today, Mayor London N. Breed issued the following statement regarding her signing of San Francisco's \$13.6 billion budget for Fiscal Year (FY) 2020-21 and \$12.4 billion budget for FY 2021-22.

“There is much we can be proud of in the two-year budget I have just signed. We have funded our Homelessness Recovery Plan that will move thousands of people from the streets and shelter into housing, continued our progress on mental health reform by funding innovative solutions like our Street Crisis Response Teams to assist those who suffer from mental illness and addiction on our streets, and followed through on our commitment to address systemic racism by making an historic investment in the African-American community. We met these key City priorities while continuing to fund our nationally-leading response to COVID with over \$450 million dedicated to testing, contact tracing, health support, food, temporary housing and shelter for our most vulnerable residents. We did all this while closing a \$1.5

billion two-year deficit without laying off a single City worker. This was, without a doubt, the most challenging budget I've ever experienced putting together, and I'm proud of everyone who worked on it, from my Budget team to all the Departmental staff.

That does not mean, however, that this Budget is perfect. We had to make a lot of hard choices to not fund certain priorities that we all support, but that's part of balancing a budget in a recession. More so, the Board of Supervisors failed to make their own hard choice when they chose to fund pay raises for City employees.

I support our City workers, and it was critical to me that we not lay anyone off during this pandemic where over 200,000 San Francisco residents have already applied for unemployment. However, giving City workers pay raises at a time when so many people are suffering is irresponsible. Workers have lost hours at work and they have lost jobs. They are sitting at home with their families trying to figure out how they are going to pay their rent. Our small business owners have had to close their doors for good. How can we tell these residents who have lost so much that we are giving our workers raises?

The Board's irresponsibility lies not only in committing to pay these raises at a time when our residents and small businesses are suffering, but also in the fact that the raises are built on funding that doesn't even exist yet. These raises are contingent on a ballot measure passing in November -- a ballot measure that we were already relying on to help balance the significant general fund deficit we were facing without any raises. If that measure fails, then we will now not only need to find a new way to close our general fund gap, but we will have to find a new way to fund these raises. Despite the fact that this decision was made a month ago, the Board has not presented an alternative solution if that were to happen. No plan of what they will choose to cut. Of course, my office has been working on this, and it's not going to be easy. It will likely require service cuts and not funding certain programs that benefit our residents. That's the reality, and we have to be honest with the public.

So while I have signed the Budget, there is much more work to do. We know there will be changes to our revenue projections in the coming weeks, and that will change things, as will the outcome of the election. I'm committed to continuing to do the work, and make the hard choices. It's how San Francisco has led the way through this public health crisis, and it's how we will continue to get ourselves back on the road to recovery."

###