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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: Starr, Aaron (CPC) <aaron.starr@sfgov.org>
Sent: Thursday, November 12, 2020 12:51 PM
To: Diamond, Susan (CPC) <sue.diamond@sfgov.org>; Koppel, Joel (CPC) <joel.koppel@sfgov.org>; Fung, Frank (CPC) <frank.fung@sfgov.org>; Moore, Kathrin (CPC) <kathrin.moore@sfgov.org>; CPC-Commissions Secretary <commissions.secretary@sfgov.org>; Imperial, Theresa (CPC) <theresa.imperial@sfgov.org>; Chan, Deland (CPC) <deland.chan@sfgov.org>
Subject: Board Report

Commissioners,

Attached, please find this week’s Board Report.

Thanks,

Aaron Starr, Manager of Legislative Affairs

PLEASE NOTE MY NEW ADDRESS AND PHONE NUMBER AS OF AUGUST 17, 2020:
49 South Van Ness Avenue, Suite 1400, San Francisco, CA 94103
Direct: +1628-652-7533 | 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, 2020. 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.
Dear Commissioners,

This is the second of a two part email for General Public Comment for today. The first email sent on Tuesday 11/10 shows six projects in five photos.
One of the issues with the extreme Alterations that should have been reviewed as Demolitions over the past six years plus, beyond the fact that the Demo Calculations were never adjusted per Section 317 (b) (2) (D), is the incredibly inefficient use of interior space.

Dominated by the kitchen as the main living level with ancillary square footage designated by developers as living room/dining room/family room, projects have expanded horizontally deep into the rear yard with full lot excavations and vertical expansions of one or two floors. And extensive changes to both the front and rear facades with lots and lots of glass on the rear as shown by the examples in my previous General Public Comment email for today, 11/12/2020.

This design creates housing that is contrary to the typical interior of a San Francisco home of the 20th century, that sits on the average or standard San Francisco lot (25 x 114) that has a hallway, light wells, setbacks, a discrete kitchen, etc and up to three bedrooms on one level. This is true for typical SF flats as well.

Even before the design issues raised in the age of COVID as detailed in the attached Wall Street Journal article, the inefficient use of interior space in San Francisco projects was key to the loss of Relative Affordability, particularly in Noe Valley and adjacent residential neighborhoods. These extreme Alterations were not reasonable expansions. Existing housing was not preserved.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Georgia Schuttish

*Why Open Plan Homes Are Actually a Terrible Idea*

Sent from my iPad
This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.
Hi Jonas,

Please find an update to the DR and Variance Submittal Sheet, p.127, of the Planning Commissioners Packet for the 11/12/20 Discretionary Review & Variance Hearing, agenda item 14a (2016-012745DRP-04) and 14b (2016-012745VAR)

This update indicates the list of the 26 letters of opposition and 1 letter of opposition from a Neighborhood Group.

Thanks,
Jane
FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE:
Thursday, November 12, 2020
Contact: Mayor’s Office of Communications, mayorspressoffice@sfgov.org

*** PRESS RELEASE ***
MAYOR BREED AND SUPERINTENDENT MATTHEWS ANNOUNCE NEW PARTNERSHIP TO ASSESS SCHOOL FACILITIES

City will send 20 Disaster Service Workers to support District staff with classroom assessments to prepare for school reopening

San Francisco, CA — Under an agreement between the San Francisco Unified School District (SFUSD) and the City and County of San Francisco, the City will be sending staff to help support the District’s school facility assessments. The District has assessed 20 schools and has an additional 65 buildings that need to be inspected to meet the goal of having its youngest students and other vulnerable student groups back in the classroom.

The District is working with the City’s COVID-19 Command Center to deploy 20 City Disaster Service Workers (DSWs) starting the week of November 16 to form School Site Assessment Teams. Disaster Service Workers are City employees from departments who perform varying emergency-related services across the City, from staffing the Emergency Operations Center to working at food banks.

The School Site Assessment Team will work with district staff to assess school facilities on a classroom by classroom basis for their readiness to receive students and staff for in-person learning during this pandemic. These evaluations will include things like operability of classroom windows; type of classroom furniture; presence of functional hand washing sinks;
and basic working condition of the classroom, for example window shades and classroom light fixtures. These Site Assessment Teams will provide valuable data on school site readiness for a hybrid or full in-person learning school day.

“We know that opening our public schools is going to be challenging, but the City is ready to do what we can to help get our kids back in schools starting in January,” said Mayor Breed. “By sending City staff over to help with school building assessments, we can speed up the work that needs to be done to make sure our classrooms are safe and healthy places for our kids and our teachers. The City will continue to find ways to support the District’s plans to open in whatever way we can because nothing matters more than ensuring that our children and our families are supported during this challenging time.”

“While SFUSD conducts annual inspections and regular maintenance related to classroom operability, new inspections are necessary in order to assess conditions in the context of COVID health and safety,” said Superintendent Dr. Vincent Matthews. “We’ve completed these site assessments at several school sites but there are dozens more to go. We are grateful to have the City’s partnership to conduct site assessments quickly and thoroughly so we can make any needed adjustments as soon as possible.”

SFUSD Superintendent Matthews shared that the district has a target date of January 25 for a return to in-person learning for the district’s youngest learners and a group of elementary school students who receive special education services if public health indicators and numerous other prerequisites are in place.

The City and school district continue to discuss other ways the City can support SFUSD with returning to in-person learning. At the recent Board of Education meeting, the School Board members voted to enter into an agreement with Curative, a testing company that will support the District’s plans for having a testing program that meets the needs for reopening. A testing program, along with ensuring classrooms are ready, are key steps in preparing for reopening.

###
Dear President Koppel and Commissioners:

On behalf of San Francisco Heritage, I write in opposition to the proposed demolition of 447 Battery Street, both on a project-specific and policy level. I regret that I am unable to testify in person at today’s hearing on the Draft EIR. Over many years, SF Heritage has consistently and emphatically decried the proliferation of facadism in San Francisco, especially projects that target historic buildings individually eligible for the California Register of Historical Resources or National Register of Historic Places.

Built in 1907, the former Jones Thierbach Coffee Co. building received a “B” rating in Heritage’s authoritative 1978 Splendid Survivors Survey, denoting structures of “Major Importance.” B-rated buildings “stand out for their overall quality rather than for any particular outstanding characteristics” and “are eligible for the National Register...and City landmark status.” (Splendid Survivors (book), San Francisco Architectural Heritage, 1979, p.12) Accordingly, Heritage testified against the proposed project when it was presented to the Architectural Review Committee of the Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) earlier this year.
The practice of “façadism” is inconsistent with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards and is widely rejected by the national and international preservation communities. In recent years, the proliferation of façade-retention projects in San Francisco has prompted the Planning Department and the HPC to develop a façade-retention policy that discourages its practice, defines minimum preservation standards, and offers alternative, more meaningful mitigation strategies. The draft HPC policy states that “character-defining features need to be retained to avoid an end-product that looks more like a hollow vestige than a public benefit.”

In our view, the proposed retention of two exterior brick walls at 447 Battery fails to meet this minimum threshold, while also giving a “green light” to future projects that may seek to demolish individually significant historic resources. It is a deeply troubling precedent that should not be countenanced by the Planning Department or this commission. Thank you for your consideration.

Mike Buhler  
President & CEO  

SAN FRANCISCO HERITAGE  
HAAS-LILIENTHAL HOUSE  
2007 FRANKLIN STREET  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94109  
W: 415.441.3000  x15  
M: 510.282.1290  

www.sfheritage.org  
mbuhler@sfheritage.org
Yes, both withdrawn.

---

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: "Fung, Frank (CPC)" <frank.fung@sfgov.org>  
Date: Thursday, November 12, 2020 at 10:11 AM  
To: "Ionin, Jonas (CPC)" <jonas.ionin@sfgov.org>  
Cc: "Feliciano, Josephine (CPC)" <josephine.feliciano@sfgov.org>  
Subject: Re: 428 Liberty: Withdrawal of Johnson DR Application  

Isn’t there two DRs on this project?  
Frank

---

From: Ionin, Jonas (CPC) <jonas.ionin@sfgov.org>  
Sent: Thursday, November 12, 2020 10:05:35 AM  
Cc: Feliciano, Josephine (CPC) <josephine.feliciano@sfgov.org>  
Subject: FW: 428 Liberty: Withdrawal of Johnson DR Application

Commissioners,  
I am pleased to inform you that the DR for Liberty has been withdrawn.

---

From: CPC-Commissions Secretary <commissions.secretary@sfgov.org>  
Date: Thursday, November 12, 2020 at 8:16 AM  
Cc: "Feliciano, Josephine (CPC)" <josephine.feliciano@sfgov.org>, "Ionin, Jonas (CPC)"
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: Winslow, David (CPC) <david.winslow@sfgov.org>
Sent: Wednesday, November 11, 2020 5:18 PM
To: Dave Johnson <dave@coupage.com>; CPC-Commissions Secretary <commissions.secretary@sfgov.org>
Cc: 'Tuija Catalano' <tcatalano@reubenlaw.com>; 'Julie Kim' <juliekim45@gmail.com>; 'Carolyn Kenady' <carolynkenady@gmail.com>; 'Shoshana Raphael' <shoshana@zfplaw.com>; 'Angelica Nguyen' <angelica@zfplaw.com>; 'Bruce Bowen' <bruce.r.bowen@gmail.com>; Raquel Johnson <raquel@coupage.com>
Subject: RE: 428 Liberty: Withdrawal of Johnson DR Application

thank you

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: Dave Johnson <dave@coupage.com>
Sent: Wednesday, November 11, 2020 1:37 PM
To: CPC-Commissions Secretary <commissions.secretary@sfgov.org>; Winslow, David (CPC)
Mr Ionin
Mr Winslow

We have reached a settlement and have signed an agreement with the project sponsors at 428 Liberty Street, San Francisco, CA. As such we immediately and irrevocably withdraw the Discretionary Review Application regarding 428 Liberty Street under 2020-007450DRP-02 filed on or about September 15, 2020.

Thank you

Dave and Raquel Johnson
437 Liberty Street
San Francisco, CA 94114
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: "Winslow, David (CPC)" <david.winslow@sfgov.org>
Date: Monday, November 9, 2020 at 9:10 AM
To: "Ionin, Jonas (CPC)" <jonas.ionin@sfgov.org>, CTYPLN - COMMISSION SECRETARY
<CPC.COMMISSIONSECRETARY@sfgov.org>
Subject: FW: neighbor letter re. DR for Record No.: 2016-012745DRP-04 311 28th street

Jonas,
please forward this to the Planning Commissioners

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: Jane Oyugi <janeoyugi@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, November 08, 2020 4:08 PM
To: Winslow, David (CPC) <david.winslow@sfgov.org>
Cc: Christopher Baker <cbakerfinance@gmail.com>
Subject: Fwd: neighbor letter re. DR for Record No.: 2016-012745DRP-04 311 28th street

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.
Hi David - below is a letter from Chris Baker. Please include it in the packet.

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

From: chris baker <cbakerfinance@gmail.com>
Date: Sun, Nov 8, 2020 at 12:15 PM
Subject: neighbor letter re. DR for Record No.: 2016-012745DRP-04 311 28th street
To: <corey.teague@sfgov.org>, <stephanie.cisneros@sfgov.org>
Cc: <janeoyugi@gmail.com>

A signed pdf of the following is attached

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

From: Christopher Baker

To: Stephanie Cisneros <stephanie.cisneros@sfgov.org> (assigned planner)

Corey Teague <corey.teague@sfgov.org> (zoning administrator)

Date: November 8, 2020

Subject: re. Discretionary Review for Record No.: 2016-012745DRP-04

• Project Address: 311 28th Street
• Permit Applications: 2016.0906.6865
• HEARING DATE: November 12, 2020
• Zoning: RH-2 [Residential House, Two-Family]
• 40-X Height and Bulk District
• Block/Lot: 6613 / 048

To Whom It May Concern:

I live at 356 28th street; uphill and across the street from the subject project. I’ve owned and lived in
this house since April 1998.

There has never been a project of this scope and size proposed, much less approved, in the 22+ years I’ve lived on the block.

The proposed project itself it out of size and scale for the neighborhood and if a variance is approved, it provides a precedent for other unreasonable projects to gain traction.

A variance should be denied for his project and a 3rd or 4th floor (however one defines the proposed top floor) of any sort should be denied as well.

Please contact me at cbakerfinance@gmail.com with any questions on this matter

Very Truly Yours,

Christopher Baker

Owner: 356 28th Street, San Francisco, CA 94131
FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE:
Monday, November 9, 2020
Contact: Mayor’s Office of Communications, mayorspressoffice@sfgov.org

*** PRESS RELEASE ***
MAYOR LONDON BREED ANNOUNCES $3.5 MILLION EXPANSION IN FINANCIAL RELIEF FOR SMALL BUSINESSES

Since March, San Francisco has dedicated nearly $21 million in grants and loans to support more than 1,150 small businesses and their employees

San Francisco, CA — Mayor London N. Breed today announced a $3.5 million expansion of the San Francisco Hardship and Emergency Loan Program (SF HELP). The program will provide zero interest loans of up to $50,000 to approximately 80 small businesses as San Francisco continues on the road to economic recovery. Since the beginning of the COVID-19 pandemic, the City has identified nearly $21 million in grants and loans for more than 1,150 local small businesses and their employees.

SF HELP promotes Mayor Breed’s focus on economic recovery. With thin margins and few reserves, many small businesses are relying on credit in order to bridge the reduced revenues that they have seen over the past several months. SF HELP fills a gap for very small businesses that lack meaningful access to credit. By offering a tool designed to sustain disadvantaged small businesses and give them the capital required to re-start their operations, SF HELP aims to advance recommendations from the City’s Economic Recovery Task Force to provide local economic stimulus, promote safe reopening, and pursue economic justice.

“I’m so glad that we’re able to provide another round of much-needed funding for San
Francisco’s small businesses. COVID-19 isn’t over and as we begin the hard work of recovering as a city, we need to continue to be there for our businesses—especially those who have difficulty accessing other forms of credit or financial assistance,” said Mayor Breed. “These zero-interest loans will help our beloved neighborhood businesses and entrepreneurs reopen safely. Small businesses, like our neighborhood restaurants, corner markets, and hair salons, keep our commercial corridors thriving and provide employment for San Franciscans. Their survival and success will help us recover together.”

The $3.5 million expansion of SF HELP will focus on private, for-profit low-income to moderate-income small businesses. The loans can be used to pay for payroll, rent, inventory, equipment, and other operating expenses businesses have as they gradually reopen. They are zero interest loans up to $50,000, with a repayment term of up to six years. There are no loan fees, personal guarantees, or collateral requirements for the borrower.

SF HELP supports entrepreneurs and business owners who are the backbone of San Francisco’s economy, many of whom are people of color with limited access to traditional credit and affordable financing. SF HELP offers the bridge financing businesses need to make it through the pandemic and provides the financial support they need to reopen and recover. The program was created in April 2020 and since then has funded 227 small businesses with $8.5 million in loans and programming. Of the 227 loans awarded, 74% are minority-owned small businesses and 52% are women-owned businesses; representing more than 20 different types of sectors such as bars, hair salons, dry cleaners, health services, restaurants, manufacturers, gyms, and child care, etc. in San Francisco. Altogether, these businesses were able to retain nearly 730 jobs. For more information on the impact of SF HELP and other financial relief for businesses, go to oewd.org/impact.

“The success of minority-owned businesses - who make up more than half of San Francisco’s small business communities - is essential for an equitable recovery and our City’s ongoing cultural and economic vitality. SF HELP has been a lifeline for those small businesses hardest hit by this pandemic, including our women-owned businesses, providing access to the capital they need to operate, pay their rent and keep their employees,” said Joaquin Torres, Director of the Office of Economic and Workforce Development. “We’re grateful for the partnerships that expand SF HELP and allow our most vulnerable San Francisco small businesses impacted by COVID-19 to feel some relief. Together with the Mission Economic Development Agency and the State’s IBank, we’re making the most of the City’s philanthropic contributions to provide easy access to the funds that will bridge small businesses as they reopen, rehire employees, and bring back the economic activity and community services that our neighborhoods need.”

SF HELP is a result of public and private partnerships that leverage various resources, including the City’s General Fund and donations to the Give2SF COVID-19 Response and Recovery Fund. This expansion of SF HELP was developed in collaboration with the Mission Economic Development Agency (MEDA), a nonprofit partner that works to provide and support small businesses with technical assistance and other services to help them reopen and recover. MEDA used $1 million from Give2SF and the City’s General Fund and a finance tool from the California Infrastructure and Economic Development Bank (IBank) to leverage and expand the loan program by $2.45 million.

“The reality for small businesses in our City has changed dramatically since March 2020. Most small businesses have a vastly diminished customer base, if they are able to continue
operating at all. Many have had to lay off their workers, and even if they received a PPP loan, those funds have been long since spent,” said Luis Granados, Chief Executive Officer, MEDA. “MEDA’s Fondo Adelante, a Community Development Financial Institution (CDFI), is proud to partner with Mayor Breed, OEWD and the California I-Bank to put into action SF HELP -- an equitable solution for quickly deploying stopgap, no-cost capital during this crisis.”

“The SF HELP loan gave us a sense of security,” said Natalia Bartrom of Infinite Beauty. “I now have confidence that I can stay in business instead of closing down.”

“The SF HELP loan helped my business with the capital it needed to stay afloat during COVID-19. It would have been very difficult to survive without this program,” said Ariel Lowis Balam-Diaz of Mi Yucatan. “I am using the funds to pay past due rent, hire an employee to help me as we reopen, and to purchase inventory.”

“Our business has not been the same since we had to shut down because of the pandemic,” said Abdul Alrammah of Yemen Kitchen. “We’ve lost about 75% of our business. Our SF HELP loan will help us pay some of our back rent – we’re 5 months behind – and pay our 2 employees.”

The loans can be used for payroll, rent, other fixed costs and inventory. Small businesses interested in applying for SF HELP can visit link.oewd.org/zeroloan. The deadline to apply is November 25 at 11:59 p.m. MEDA will then hold a lottery to determine which businesses will be invited to submit a formal application; this lottery will include a preference for low- to moderate-income-owned businesses throughout the city.

###
FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE:
Tuesday, November 10, 2020
Contact: Mayor’s Office of Communications, mayorspressoffice@sfgov.org

*** PRESS RELEASE ***

MAYOR LONDON BREED AND SUPERVISOR MATT HANEY INTRODUCE LEGISLATION TO PREVENT FRIVOLOUS APPEALS FROM DELAYING CITY PROJECTS AND POLICIES

Legislation would raise the requirements for City projects to be appealed and allow them to continue during the appeals process to prevent unnecessary delays

San Francisco, CA — Mayor London N. Breed and District 6 Supervisor Matt Haney today introduced legislation designed to prevent the abuse of the appeals process for City projects and policies that often result in unnecessary delays and increased costs. Under current law, one person is capable of appealing and pausing projects and policies related to transportation, public works, infrastructure, and the environment. The legislation maintains the ability for appeals to be filed, but raises the requirements to prevent frivolous appeals that result in project delays and cost increases.

One recent example was an appeal of the City’s Slow Streets program, which is designed to give pedestrians access to roads with limited car traffic in order to safely move around San Francisco during the global COVID-19 pandemic. This appeal of the Slow Streets program was filed by just two individuals. While the appeal was eventually dismissed unanimously, the delay was unnecessary and resulted in hundreds of hours of staff time that could have otherwise been spent responding to other City and resident needs. Additionally, the appeal
meant countless residents in neighborhoods throughout the City did not have access to a nearby Slow Street for weeks, and in some cases months. A total of six separate appeals have been filed to stall San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) projects since June.

“Our response to the pandemic has shown that San Francisco is capable of doing great things when we don’t get in our own way,” said Mayor Breed. “People should be able to appeal projects and policies that are going to impact our city and their lives, but by setting the bar so low for an appeal to be filed, we set ourselves up for delays and cost overruns before we even get started. That’s a system designed to fail. This legislation allows for appeals to continue, while preventing frivolous appeals that keep our city from moving forward.”

Under the legislation, appeals to the Board of Supervisors for projects that are not directly under their decision-making authority would require 50 signatures from San Francisco residents, or five members of the Board of Supervisors, as opposed to the current rules that require just one appellant. Furthermore, a number of project types could continue while the appeal is being heard, such as projects that are temporary in nature, involve easily reversible physical changes, or are related to health and safety.

“This is common sense, necessary legislation, only applying to public projects, that will improve our city’s ability to act decisively and respond with urgency to meet public needs, while still protecting the right to appeal,” said Supervisor Haney. “The public’s right to appeal government decisions is an important part of our democracy, but a single person should not be able to completely derail a public project like Slow Streets or emergency transit lanes that fulfill a clear public purpose and can be reversed.”

“After the recent CEQA appeal that paused Slow Streets was rejected, our teams were in the streets within 12 hours and new Slow Streets were installed on Clay and Noe streets and Pacific and Tompkins avenues in less than a week,” said SFMTA Director of Transportation Jeffrey Tumlin. “These welcoming and accessible improvements are needed to keep our city moving during this crisis. With fewer frivolous appeals, staff could instead spend time on the City’s recovery.”

Under the legislation, the Slow Streets program appeal would have required 50 signatures to be filed, and implementation of the program would have been allowed to continue during the appeal, since the physical changes are easily reversible and only require removing signs saying the road is closed to through traffic.

“We want to thank Mayor Breed and Supervisor Haney for their forward-thinking legislation that will help our city meet our Vision Zero and Transit First goals with urgency,” said Janice Li, Advocacy Director for the San Francisco Bicycle Coalition. “The San Francisco Bicycle Coalition enthusiastically supports this legislation that lets the City planners do what they do best: design safe streets that make it easier for people to walk, bike and take transit.”

###
FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE:
Tuesday, November 10, 2020
Contact: San Francisco Joint Information Center, dempress@sfgov.org

*** PRESS RELEASE ***
SAN FRANCISCO TO ROLL BACK SELECT ACTIVITIES IN RESPONSE TO INCREASE IN COVID-19 CASES

Due to an increase in COVID-19 cases, San Francisco will roll back the reopening of indoor dining, reduce capacity of fitness centers and movie theaters, and will pause approval of plans for indoor instruction for high schools.

Department of Public Health will assess the situation and resumption of further reopening is dependent on improvement of COVID-19 impact on City

San Francisco, CA — Mayor London N. Breed and Director of Health Dr. Grant Colfax today announced the City will adjust its reopening due to a significant and rapid increase in COVID-19 case rates in San Francisco, coupled with the current increase in cases and hospitalizations in California and across the United States. San Francisco will temporarily roll back the reopening of indoor dining, and will reduce the capacity of fitness centers and movie theaters. Additionally, San Francisco will pause the reopening of indoor instruction at high schools that have not already opened. These changes will go into effect at 11:59 pm on Friday, November 13, 2020.
San Francisco is rolling back these activities in an effort to contain the spread of the virus by focusing on higher risk indoor activities and other behaviors that increase the concentration of aerosols. The Department of Public Health will continue to closely monitor the City’s case count, infection rate, and hospitalization rate in order to determine how quickly we can flatten the curve and determine when we can resume safe reopening.
“I cannot emphasize enough how important it is that everyone act responsibly to reduce the spread of the virus. Every San Franciscan needs to do their part so that we can start moving in the right direction again,” said Mayor Breed. “I know this is not the news our residents and businesses wanted to hear, but as I’ve said all along, we’re making decisions based on the data we’re seeing on the ground. Right now, our public health officials are telling us we need to take these steps to get the virus under control and save lives – so that’s what we’re doing. The hard decisions we’re making now will help us get our youngest residents back to school. We will continue to act in the best interest of public health and we’ll continue to help our impacted businesses as much as we are able. I am hopeful that in the coming months we will have support from our federal government to support these businesses and the losses they have suffered as well. I will certainly be advocating that we do.”

Since October 2, San Francisco has experienced a 250% increase in COVID-19 cases. The rolling back of certain businesses and activities is necessary to mitigate the aggressive growth of the virus that would cost lives and threaten the capacity of our health care system. This step is aimed to minimize the activities that are known to be of higher risk for increasing the spread of the virus – particularly indoor activities, high traffic activities, and those that allow for mask removal or increase the production of aerosols, such as physical activity and eating. San Francisco is reducing the capacity at which fitness centers and movie theaters are allowed to operate. Indoor dining will need to close at this time. High schools that have not yet opened will remain closed for any indoor instruction, though DPH will work with high schools that want to reopen educational programming in an outdoor setting.

One of the key indicators of COVID-19 prevalence in the city, the number of new cases per day per 100,000 people, has more than doubled over the last three weeks from a low of 3.7 cases per 100,000 people to 9 cases per 100,000 people. The rate of increase in hospitalizations of COVID-19 patients is also a key indicator that affects the pace of reopening. San Francisco recently hit a low of 21 people in the hospital with COVID, but expects that number will increase in the coming weeks.

“One of the key indicators of COVID-19 prevalence in the city, the number of new cases per day per 100,000 people, has more than doubled over the last three weeks from a low of 3.7 cases per 100,000 people to 9 cases per 100,000 people. The rate of increase in hospitalizations of COVID-19 patients is also a key indicator that affects the pace of reopening. San Francisco recently hit a low of 21 people in the hospital with COVID, but expects that number will increase in the coming weeks.

“From the beginning of the City’s pandemic response, San Francisco has carefully monitored and responded to the pandemic, which has helped us lead the country in our containment,” said Dr. Grant Colfax, San Francisco Director of Health. “As always, we must listen to the data. The data is now telling us this virus is rapidly traveling throughout our city. If we do not take immediate action, we will have the increase in cases and hospitalizations that we have seen in many other cities across the country and around the world, but have yet to experience in San Francisco.”

The Department of Public Health will continue to monitor the City’s COVID-19 Key Public Health Indicators and other information to determine whether the infection rate is stabilizing and when the City can resume reopening. The City strongly encourages San Franciscans to avoid gatherings, wear face coverings when leaving home, and keep their distance from other people, and to get tested for COVID-19 if they feel sick.

This rollback will mean lost revenue for businesses that are already stretched thin. In an effort to support those businesses that are directly impacted, the Mayor is dedicating $4 million through the following programming:

- $2.5 million will be available to waive taxes and fees for impacted small businesses, including fees for winter augmentations such as heaters. More information about how to participate is forthcoming.
- $500,000 will be available through the Shared Spaces Equity Grants program for small
neighborhood-serving businesses to pay for technical assistance and capital costs of setting up and augmenting shared spaces for restaurants to operate outdoors. More information about this program is forthcoming.

- $500,000 in grant funding will be available through SF Shines for Reopening for restaurants to purchase equipment and re-configure space in order to meet social distancing requirements. For more information: link.oewd.org/sfshines.
- $500,000 will be available through SF HELP zero interest loans to low- and moderate-income restaurant owners with little access to credit in order to pay for fixed costs, inventory, and other operating expenses. For more information: link.oewd.org/zeroloan.

“This rollback will be extremely tough for our restaurants and bars who are already struggling to make ends meet, but we must work together to contain this virus, trust the science before us, and once again flatten this curve. Our economy and the thousands of employees that need and depend on this work rests with each of us to do our part,” said Joaquin Torres, Director of the Office of Economic and Workforce Development. “These dedicated funds will focus on those small businesses, restaurants and bars that will be severely impacted by this rollback and offer some supportive relief as we continue our push towards economic recovery. In the coming weeks, our office, under the leadership of Mayor Breed, will continue to advocate our state and federal partners for the substantial relief necessary to stabilize our small businesses and support their employees.”

The following activities will halt indoor operations until further notice:

- Indoor dining at restaurants or bars serving meals in any context including standalone restaurants, food courts in shopping centers, and dining establishments in hotels, museums or other venues.

The following activities will pause until further notice:

- High schools that are not already open with approved plans. (Switching to outdoor instruction within certain parameters).

The following activities will be required to reduce capacity to a maximum of 50 people indoors:

- Fitness centers may remain open to the lesser of 25% capacity or 50 people (down from 100).
- Movie theaters may remain open to the lesser of 25% capacity or 50 people (down from 100).

All other businesses and activities that are currently allowed may continue operating at this time, including outdoor dining and take-out, elementary and middle schools, offices, retail shopping, personal services, and cultural and family activities such as museums and aquariums.

San Francisco is taking this action in order to prevent further rollbacks of businesses and activities that have reopened and to support elementary and middle schools, community hubs and other learning and development activities to continue to open as safely as possible.

San Francisco’s increase in cases is significant but not unique. California has seen a 29% increase in new positive cases over the last week and many counties have been re-assigned to more restrictive tiers on the State’s system. Other Bay Area counties, such as Contra Costa, are also seeing a significant increase in cases and have started considering similar measures to curtail activities in order to slow the spread of the virus, despite what they are allowed by the State. The City’s relative success in managing the virus to-date is due to its COVID-19
response infrastructure, which includes testing, contact tracing, and support services, its deliberate and measured approach to reopening, and a willingness to act quickly and aggressively in order to protect public health.

The Department of Public Health will monitor the Health Indicators, the risk of specific activities, the estimated reproductive rate of the virus, the regional data and the State’s actions in determining when and how to move forward, pause, or dial back reopening. More information about San Francisco’s reopening timeline can be found at https://sf.gov/step-by-step/reopening-san-francisco.

###
On 11/11/20, 10:26 PM, "James Ahn" <ahn.jamesh@gmail.com> wrote:

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

To the Planning Review Board,

I am writing to express my strong OPPOSITION to the planned development at 695 Rhode Island St. The plans for this project, including the height addition, are vastly incongruous with the existing street design. The current facade is already in conflict with the adjacent one-story building at 697 Rhode Island (which will never be built higher due to existing height restrictions), and building even higher would disrupt the design on the street even more.

As a property owner directly across the street, I oppose this plan which would disrupt the character of the street and seemingly violates planning guidelines with abrupt height changes.

I hope you will reconsider approval.

Thank you.
James Ahn
2004 19th ST.
Dear Members of the Planning and Discretionary Review Board

As an owner directly across from 695 Rhode Island St, I join my neighbors in OPPOSING the current plans for development at 695 Rhode Island. In particular, the planned height addition will disrupt the current character of the street. The added height is in direct conflict with the building just to the south (697 Rhode Island), and these plans would create a sudden and unsightly change in facade.

In addition, no other homes on that street have outdoor patio space facing the street, which would again be incongruous with the existing character.

I OPPOSE this plan, and ask that you direct modifications during your review.

Respectfully,
Ashley Cowart
2004 19th ST (neighbor directly across the street)
Dear David Winslow and Discretionary Review Commission-

I have lived at 666 Rhode Island Street San Francisco since 1978, over the last 42 years I have seen many new buildings and additions on my street all of which have been built to fit into the existing housing roof lines of the neighborhood. The proposed height of 695 Rhode Island Street doesn’t fit in with the neighborhood roof lines and I oppose the project’s height. I support the discretionary review on this project. Over the years I saw empty lots get new houses and small cottages expand and add new levels, all of this was done in keeping with heights of the surrounding structures and working with the neighbors, I have seen this process at work and feel that this can be achieved with this project as well.

Best-

Kit Morris

KIT MORRIS
415.608.9814
kit@kitmorris.com
To David Winslow & the Planning Commission,

As an across-the-street neighbor to the property at 695 Rhode Island Street, the new development on that property will have an impact on my life every single day. It will be part of my home's primary view. While I respect my neighbor’s rights to improve their housing structures and make them better suit and support their lifestyle, I also ardently believe in and encourage respectful planning that takes into consideration the overall visual quality of the neighborhood and characteristics of the streetscape on which it resides.

The proposed expansion of the 695 Rhode Island building is quite significant, increasing the mass of the structure by 59.3%! A 1,599 sq ft expansion represents basically a "second home" being built on one property which is alot to squeeze into an already too densely built area. The proposed height of the expansion of 695 Rhode Island will cause it to effectively tower over its neighboring properties, and in fact, many properties on both sides of the street. We have worked hard in our neighborhood to maintain a pleasing, stepwise roofline effect which this project's height will plainly violate. As such, I oppose the height of the proposed structure and support the discretionary review of this project.

Neighborhoods are lovely or not based on the look and feel and interaction of its structures. I appreciate that there are city Planning Departments to help ensure that the integrity of our city's neighborhood streets remain intact. The character of a neighborhood is represented by its structures and only thoughtful consideration of how each new structure fits into that delicate fabric will protect the beauty of San Francisco neighborhoods. Careful and sensitive planning is never a
wasted effort and I am confident that the existing structure can both be expanded AND effectively blended into the existing streetscape.

Thank you for your consideration,
Lynelle Hanson

InteriorInnovations.lh@gmail.com
408.592.0312
Hi Jonas,

For distribution to the CPC, please find attached a letter summarizing the HPC's comments on the 447 Battery St Draft EIR. The CPC is reviewing/commenting on the DEIR in today's hearing.

Thanks,

Jørgen G. Cleemann, Senior Planner (he/him)
Historic Preservation/Environmental Planning Division
San Francisco Planning

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

49 South Van Ness Avenue, Suite 1400, San Francisco, CA 94103
Direct: 628.652.7552 | 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.
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](http://www.sfplanning.org)  
San Francisco Property Information Map

---

From: "Hillis, Rich (CPC)" <rich.hillis@sfgov.org>  
Date: Thursday, November 12, 2020 at 5:49 AM  
To: "Ionin, Jonas (CPC)" <jonas.ionin@sfgov.org>  
Cc: Rachel Schuett <rachel.schuett@sfgov.org>, Lisa Gibson <lisa.gibson@sfgov.org>  
Subject: Fw: Introduction - Resolution - Landmark Initiation - 447 Battery Street Jones-Thierbach Coffee Company Building

Jonas - See below. Pls distribute to Commissioners. Thanks, Rich

---

From: Peskin, Aaron (BOS) <aaron.peskin@sfgov.org>  
Sent: Tuesday, November 10, 2020 5:26 PM  
To: Hillis, Rich (CPC) <rich.hillis@sfgov.org>  
Cc: Hepner, Lee (BOS) <lee.hepner@sfgov.org>  
Subject: FW: Introduction - Resolution - Landmark Initiation - 447 Battery Street Jones-Thierbach Coffee Company Building

FYI. Please distribute to your commission.  
Aaron

---

From: Hepner, Lee (BOS) <lee.hepner@sfgov.org>  
Sent: Tuesday, November 10, 2020 5:07 PM  
To: BOS Legislation, (BOS) <bos.legislation@sfgov.org>  
Cc: Peskin, Aaron (BOS) <aaron.peskin@sfgov.org>  
Subject: Introduction - Resolution - Landmark Initiation - 447 Battery Street Jones-Thierbach Coffee Company Building

Please see the subject introduction attached hereto.
Thanks,
Lee

Lee Hepner
Legislative Aide
Supervisor Aaron Peskin
(415) 554-7419 | pronouns: he, him, his

District 3 Website
Sign up for our newsletter here!
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: Dave Johnson <dave@coupage.com>
Sent: Wednesday, November 11, 2020 1:37 PM
To: CPC-Commissions Secretary <commissions.secretary@sfgov.org>; Winslow, David (CPC) <david.winslow@sfgov.org>
Cc: 'Tuija Catalano' <tcatalano@reubenlaw.com>; 'Julie Kim' <juliekim45@gmail.com>; 'Carolyn Kenady' <carolynkenady@gmail.com>; 'Shoshana Raphael' <shoshana@zfplaw.com>; 'Angelica Nguyen' <angelica@zfplaw.com>; 'Bruce Bowen' <bruce.r.bowen@gmail.com>; Raquel Johnson <raquel@coupage.com>
Subject: 428 Liberty: Withdrawal of Johnson DR Application

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

Mr Ionin
Mr Winslow

We have reached a settlement and have signed an agreement with the project sponsors at 428 Liberty Street, San Francisco, CA. As such we immediately and irrevocably withdraw the Discretionary Review Application regarding 428 Liberty Street under 2020-007450DRP-02 filed on or about September 15, 2020.

Thank you

Dave and Raquel Johnson
437 Liberty Street
San Francisco, CA 94114
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: William Holtzman <wm@holtzman.com>
Sent: Wednesday, November 11, 2020 3:45 PM
To: Horn, Jeffrey (CPC) <jeffrey.horn@sfgov.org>; CPC-Commissions Secretary <commissions.secretary@sfgov.org>
Subject: November 19 Hearing Record No. 2019-013808CUAVAR; 4300 17th St

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

Attention Planning Department and Planning Commission. The attached PDF documents my concerns regarding this matter.

Many thanks for your kind consideration.

Sincerely,
William Holtzman
60 Lower Terrace
San Francisco
Dear SF Planning Commission,

I'm writing today to express my strong support for the 469 Stevenson Street project which will be heard during tomorrow's hearing. This project will create nearly 500 sorely needed homes in the midst of a housing supply crisis. This project is near BART and Muni lines and will therefore help SF significantly mitigate climate change by creating a built environment that allows people to live and work without a car.

This project will help meet the housing demand generated from the 5M office building (630,000
sqft) that's currently under construction a few blocks away. Building new homes near office buildings, like this project, reduces commute times and proactively prevents displacement. In fact, the land is currently used as a parking lot. This relic of the fossil fuel era does not deserve to be part of the built environment in such a transit and job-rich area as downtown San Francisco.

The above concerns re mitigating SF’s housing shortage and climate change should override any micromanagement of this project by the Planning Department & Commission re aesthetics, shadows, and building heights. These are arbitrary and abstract limits that hurt SF’s ability to address the housing shortage and climate change because projects take years to get approved and are needlessly downsized, creating fewer homes. This project has been under review since at least 2017. The project’s renderings reveal a beautiful building that fits with the neighborhood. Additionally, the building height is appropriate for the neighborhood. The project is near the under construction 5M project which will result in 500, 400 & 200 ft buildings. Also, it’s almost as tall as the blue/green building at Market & 6th St. If anything, this building should be closer to 400 ft to better fit the character of the neighborhood and provide even more homes near transit and jobs.

SF must change its mindset from onerous negotiation and review of every individual project. We need housing abundance in San Francisco. Please approve this project quickly. I am a renter in SF and the more housing units we have on the market, the more negotiating leverage every tenant has with future landlords.

I hope the Planning Commission will approve this project as quickly as possible to prevent displacement and mitigate climate change.

Thank you,

Scot
From: CPC-Commissions Secretary  
To: Feliciano, Josephine (CPC)  
Subject: FW: General Public Comment November 12, 2020  
Date: Tuesday, November 10, 2020 1:40:25 PM  
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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: Tuesday, November 10, 2020 10:42 AM  
To: Koppel, Joel (CPC) <joel.koppel@sfgov.org>; Kathrin Moore <mooreurban@aol.com>; 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>; rachel.tanner@sfgov.org  
Cc: CPC-Commissions Secretary <commissions.secretary@sfgov.org>; Ionin, Jonas (CPC) <jonas.ionin@sfgov.org>; Hillis, Rich (CPC) <rich.hillis@sfgov.org>; Winslow, David (CPC) <david.winslow@sfgov.org>  
Subject: General Public Comment November 12, 2020

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

Dear Commissioners  
These five photos illustrate the large glazing on the rear of projects for both extreme Alterations and new construction.  
These rear facades, these walls of glass, are the universal trend in projects.  
They adversely affect the rear yard mid-block open space and they are contrary to the Residential Design Guidelines.  
Sincerely,
Good afternoon,

The Responses to Comments (RTC) on the Draft EIR for the proposed 550 O'Farrell Street Project, Case No. 2017-004557ENV, has been published today, November 9, 2020.

To review, please use the link below:

Responses to Comments on the Draft EIR (550 O'Farrell St, 2017-004557ENV)

Please note that the certification of the Draft EIR will be before the Planning Commission on December 10, 2020.

Should you have any questions or require any additional materials, please contact me at the project email address, CPC.550OFarrellStEIR@sfgov.org, or at (628) 652-7563.

Sincerely,

Jennifer Barbour McKellar, MPA, Senior Planner

Environmental Planning Division
San Francisco Planning

PLEASE NOTE MY NEW ADDRESS AND PHONE NUMBER AS OF AUGUST 17:
49 South Van Ness Avenue, Suite 1400, San Francisco, CA 94103
Direct: 628.652.7563 | 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.
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: Wilborn, Katherine (CPC) <katherine.wilborn@sfgov.org>
Sent: Monday, November 09, 2020 8:17 AM
To: Ionin, Jonas (CPC) <jonas.ionin@sfgov.org>; Son, Chanbory (CPC) <chanbory.son@sfgov.org>;
CTYPLN - COMMISSION SECRETARY <CPC.COMMISSIONSECRETARY@sfgov.org>
Subject: RE: Nov. 12th CPC - 2019-017837CUA

Good morning Chan and Jonas,

The (attached) items were not included in the packet because the DBI document is an internal-only resource (to my knowledge), and the Project Sponsor’s exhibits are redundant to the exhibits I compiled/included. However, since the sponsor’s exhibits were submitted alongside the Sponsor Brief, I thought that this document should be provided to the commissioners, if they so choose to review.

Let me know if you all send the documents to Commissioners, or if I can (and if I’m to send them along, would you mind providing me the commissioner’s emails?).

Thank you!
Katie
PLEASE NOTE: At this time, my work schedule is Monday – Thursday and the best way to reach me is via email.
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: Ionin, Jonas (CPC) <jonas.ionin@sfgov.org>
Sent: Thursday, November 5, 2020 9:32 AM
To: Son, Chanbory (CPC) <chanbory.son@sfgov.org>; Wilborn, Katherine (CPC) <katherine.wilborn@sfgov.org>; CTYPLN - COMMISSION SECRETARY <CPC.COMMISSIONSECRETARY@sfgov.org>
Subject: Re: Nov. 12th CPC - 2019-017837CUA

Katie,
We do not send the packets to Commissioners via email. They download the documents from our webpage.

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: "Son, Chanbory (CPC)" <chanbory.son@sfgov.org>
Date: Thursday, November 5, 2020 at 9:31 AM
To: "Wilborn, Katherine (CPC)" <katherine.wilborn@sfgov.org>, CTYPLN - COMMISSION SECRETARY <CPC.COMMISSIONSECRETARY@sfgov.org>
Cc: "Ionin, Jonas (CPC)" <jonas.ionin@sfgov.org>
Subject: RE: Nov. 12th CPC - 2019-017837CUA

Katie,
Is there any reason why those documents cannot be added to the packet? The packets has not been published yet so you could still add them.

Thank you,
Chanbory Son, Executive Secretary
Commission Affairs
San Francisco Planning Department
PLEASE NOTE MY NEW ADDRESS AND PHONE NUMBER AS OF AUGUST 17, 2020:
49 South Van Ness Avenue, Suite 1400, San Francisco, CA 94103
Direct: 628.652.7346 | sfplanning.org
Hello Commission Team,

I submitted my Commission Packet for 2019-017837CUA (1812-1816 Green Street) to the I:Drive and wanted to give you a heads-up that it is a very large document (almost 200 pages). I've reduced the file size several times, so I hope sending it via email to the commissioners will not be a problem.

In addition to the packet, I have (2) documents to share with the commission as supporting resources (attached), and I wanted to inform them that the former tenant reached out and stated that she supports a disapproval of the proposed project.

Should I email the commissioners with this information/attachments, or is the appropriate avenue for the Commission Team to transmit these?

Please let me know.
Thanks!
Katie

Katie B. Wilborn (she/her)
Planner | Preservation Specialist
Northwest Quadrant, Current Planning Division
San Francisco Planning Department
49 South Van Ness Avenue, Suite 1400, San Francisco, CA 94103
Direct: 628.652.7355 | www.sfplanning.org

San Francisco Property Information Map

PLEASE NOTE: At this time, my work schedule is Monday – Thursday and the best way to reach me is via email.
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](#).
FW: neighbor letter re. DR for Record No.: 2016-012745DRP-04 311 28th street

Jonas,

please forward this to the Planning Commissioners

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

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.

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

--------- Forwarded message --------
From: chris baker <cbakerfinance@gmail.com>
Date: Sun, Nov 8, 2020 at 12:15 PM
Subject: neighbor letter re. DR for Record No.: 2016-012745DRP-04 311 28th street
To: <corey.teague@sfgov.org>, <stephanie.cisneros@sfgov.org>
Cc: <janeoyugi@gmail.com>

A signed pdf of the following is attached

__________________________________________________________

From: Christopher Baker

To: Stephanie Cisneros <stephanie.cisneros@sfgov.org> (assigned planner)

        Corey Teague <corey.teague@sfgov.org> (zoning administrator)

Date: November 8, 2020

Subject: re. Discretionary Review for Record No.: 2016-012745DRP-04

- Project Address: 311 28th Street
- Permit Applications: 2016.0906.6865
- HEARING DATE: November 12, 2020
To Whom It May Concern:

I live at 356 28th street; uphill and across the street from the subject project. I’ve owned and lived in this house since April 1998.

There has never been a project of this scope and size proposed, much less approved, in the 22+ years I’ve lived on the block.

The proposed project itself it out of size and scale for the neighborhood and if a variance is approved, it provides a precedent for other unreasonable projects to gain traction.

A variance should be denied for his project and a 3rd or 4th floor (however one defines the proposed top floor) of any sort should be denied as well.

Please contact me at cbakerfinance@gmail.com with any questions on this matter

Very Truly Yours,

Christopher Baker

Owner: 356 28th Street, San Francisco, CA 94131
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.

-----Original Message-----
From: paul allen <sfcapaul@me.com>
Sent: Sunday, November 08, 2020 6:55 PM
To: CPC-Commissions Secretary <commissions.secretary@sfgov.org>
Subject: Re: Hearing Procedures; Nov. 19 Hearing

Thank you for this response. On behalf of my neighborhood organization, Corbett Heights Neighbors, we will be filing no later than Tuesday morning a memorandum in opposition to the request for variances and CUA’s and, as well, a request in our cover letter for a speaking slot, preferably as “organized opposition.”. Per your email, we will email the PDF to Jeff Horn, with a copy to you.

For both our organization and individual neighbors who may wish to offer their one minute of opposition at the hearing, can you tell exactly how they will know the mechanics? Such as speaking via Zoom or whatever the device?

Thank you in advance and apologies but I did not see this level of detail on the website, though perhaps I missed it.

Paul Allen
96 Mars
On behalf of Corbett Heights Neighbors

> On Oct 26, 2020, at 11:16 AM, CPC-Commissions Secretary <commissions.secretary@sfgov.org> wrote:
> 
> Thank you for your inquiry. A pdf sent to the planner will suffice at this time.
> 
> 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

> https://avanan.url-protection.com/v1/url?o=www.sfplanning.org&g=NjY0YjA5YWMzNw==&h=OTQzYTk3MWVkZDFiNjRhN2Y1ODBkODMxNzNiYTQ2YWQ1MTM3NjU2MmViYjBhZWUyZDImOTgwZGFhZDc3MzE3Yg==&p=YXAzOnNmZHQyOmF2YW5hbjpvZmZp
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.

-----Original Message-----
From: paul allen <sfcapaul@me.com>
Sent: Saturday, October 24, 2020 9:57 AM
To: CPC-Commissions Secretary <commissions.secretary@sfgov.org>
Subject: Hearing Procedures

Greetings,

Forgive my ignorance but am I reading the procedures correctly that, even with remote proceedings during covid, interested parties must submit 15 hardcopies (and a PDF to the relevant planner) 8 days prior to the hearing?

Thank you for clarifying this.

Paul Allen
96 Mars

Sent from my iPad
Commissioners,

Attached are your Calendars for November 12, 2020.

Cheers,

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: DCP, Reception (CPC)
To: Son, Chanbory (CPC); Feliciano, Josephine (CPC)
Subject: Mail for Planning Commissioners - Letter re: 311 28th St - VAR and DR hearing
Date: Thursday, November 05, 2020 2:03:23 PM
Attachments: Letter - 311 28th St - VAR and DR hearing.pdf
November 5, 2020

Commissioners,

re: Item 9. OPPPOSE 2020-003248PCA [Board File No. 201008]

Ordinance amending the Planning Code to clarify the ministerial approval process for certain Accessory Dwelling Units
Please do to support 201008 when it come to you for consideration. Removing the public notice and public review of the development of our environment does nothing to enhance the public trust in the government process or the government representatives that back such efforts.

There is an article in the Examiner this week entitled,

“Lesson for Dems: Don’t preach social justice without delivering economic justice”

These bills that support a market solution and trickle down housing are a perfect example of why citizens do not trust the government to deliver economic justice.

ADUs were introduced as a new solution to create more affordable housing in SF within the existing housing envelope. These ADUs were required to adhere to rent control standards to remain affordable.

Now units labeled ADUs are being built outside existing building envelopes, in backyards and new construction in a manner that no longer resembles the original ADUs. What is the point?

What defines a unit as an ADU when it no longer fits inside the building envelope or is affordable, and why should the public trust the government to deliver social or economic justice when most of the legislation is geared toward removing public notice and control over our environment?

This is the wrong way to unite us.

Sincerely,

Mari Eliza, Concerned Citizen

PS: Sorry for the late hour
From: CPC-Commissions Secretary
To: Chan, Deland (CPC); Diamond, Susan (CPC); Fung, Frank (CPC); Imperial, Theresa (CPC); Koppel, Joel (CPC); Moore, Kathrin (CPC); Tanner, Rachael (BOA)
Subject: FW: 201 2nd Street - 2019-015642CUA
Date: Thursday, November 05, 2020 11:57:00 AM
Attachments: DraftMotion-201 02nd Street-2019-015642CUA-11.4.2020_CT (1).docx
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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: Fahey, Carolyn (CPC) <carolyn.fahey@sfgov.org>
Sent: Thursday, November 05, 2020 11:56 AM
To: Diamond, Susan (CPC) <sue.diamond@sfgov.org>; CPC-Commissions Secretary <commissions.secretary@sfgov.org>; Teague, Corey (CPC) <corey.teague@sfgov.org>
Cc: Feliciano, Josephine (CPC) <josephine.feliciano@sfgov.org>
Subject: RE: 201 2nd Street - 2019-015642CUA

These docs have track changes for the majority of the revisions.

Best,

Carolyn Fahey, AICP, EcoDistrict AP, Planner II
Southwest Team/Current Planning
San Francisco Planning
49 South Van Ness Avenue, Suite 1400, San Francisco, CA 94103
Direct: 628.652.7367 | www.sfplanning.org
San Francisco Property Information Map

***Please note: I will be out of office November 23rd thru 27th and will return Monday, November 30th ***
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: Diamond, Susan (CPC) <sue.diamond@sfgov.org>
Sent: Thursday, November 5, 2020 11:44 AM
To: CPC-Commissions Secretary <commissions.secretary@sfgov.org>; Fahey, Carolyn (CPC) <carolyn.fahey@sfgov.org>; Teague, Corey (CPC) <corey.teague@sfgov.org>
Cc: Feliciano, Josephine (CPC) <josephine.feliciano@sfgov.org>
Subject: Re: 201 2nd Street - 2019-015642CUA

Is it possible for one of you to send a redline of the revised motion so we can review the changes?

From: CPC-Commissions Secretary <commissions.secretary@sfgov.org>
Sent: Thursday, November 5, 2020 11:33 AM
Cc: Feliciano, Josephine (CPC) <josephine.feliciano@sfgov.org>
Subject: FW: 201 2nd Street - 2019-015642CUA
Hi All,

RII with full case report.

Carolyn Fahey, AICP, EcoDistrict AP, Planner II
Southwest Team/Current Planning
San Francisco Planning
49 South Van Ness Avenue, Suite 1400, San Francisco, CA 94103
Direct: 628.652.7367 | www.sfplanning.org
San Francisco Property Information Map

***Please note: I will be out of office November 23rd thru 27th and will return Monday, November 30th ***

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: Fahey, Carolyn (CPC)
Sent: Wednesday, November 4, 2020 5:46 PM
To: CPC-Commissions Secretary <commissions.secretary@sfgov.org>
Cc: Asbagh, Claudine (CPC) <claudine.asbagh@sfgov.org>; Teague, Corey (CPC) <corey.teague@sfgov.org>
Subject: 201 2nd Street - 2019-015642CUA
In response to a couple incisive questions from Commissioner Diamond, please find attached revised motion for case no. 2019-015642CUA (201 2nd Street) on tomorrow's consent agenda. Revisions are primarily to adapt the Department’s standard conditions of approval to this case. Clarifications include:

- The start and stop date of an approved extension. This includes revisions to related findings, conditions of approval (specifically time allowances for vesting an approval).
- That there is no limit to the total number of renewals that can be sought in the C-3-O(SD) Zone District. This includes revisions to related findings.
- That screening requirements are not triggered by the proposal. This includes minor revisions to related findings and conditions of approval.
- Clarity that the proposal is a 'temporary extension of an existing use' permitted by a Conditional Use Authorization. This includes minor revisions to project description.

Please let me know if you have questions.

Thanks,

Carolyn Fahey, AICP, EcoDistrict AP, PhD, Planner II
Southwest Team/Current Planning
San Francisco Planning
49 South Van Ness Avenue, Suite 1400, San Francisco, CA 94103
Direct: 628.652.7367 | 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.