



# EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

## PLANNING COMMISSION RULES AND REGULATIONS

**HEARING DATE: August 26, 2021**

**Continued From: May 27, 2021, June 10, 2021, June 24, 2021, and July 15, 2021**

**Record No.:** 2021-004810CRV  
**Staff Contact:** Laura Lynch- (628) 652-7554  
[laura.lynch@sfgov.org](mailto:laura.lynch@sfgov.org)

**Recommendation:** Adopt Amendments

### Project Description

Charter Section 4.104, states that “each commission shall adopt rules and regulations consistent with this Charter and ordinances of the City and County. No rule or regulation shall be adopted, amended or repealed, without a public hearing. At least ten days' public notice shall be given for such public hearing. All such rules and regulations shall be filed with the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors.” The Planning Commission currently has adopted Rules and Regulations that have been amended several times. The most recent amendment occurred on July 2, 2015.

In accordance with Charter Section 4.104(a)1, each time a rule or regulation is amended, a public hearing must occur. The proposed amendments to the CPC Rules are Regulations (Attachment A) are shown in tracked changes. Any addition or deletion is annotated in red font and appears as a strike through for deletions or underlined demonstrating new text was added. Some text shown as new or deleted may have been moved to another section (i.e. Submittals).

### Required Commission Action

In order for the Project to proceed, the Commission must adopt amendments to the CPC Rules and Regulations. If adopted, the amended Rules and Regulations will be filed with the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors.

## Comments Received and Community Outreach

The Planning Commission has received a total of 18 emails or letters with regards to the CPC Rules and Regulations. These emails and letters can be found under Attachment C. These letters and emails were provided from various individuals and community groups. In addition, at various Planning Commission Hearings, public testimony was provided during General Public Comment related to the proposed amendments to the CPC Rules and Regulations. A summary of these concerns presented both digitally and orally include the following: limitations of presentation times, intent of changes, timing of advanced packets, General Public Comment order, and the posting of the agenda and staff packets.

The Planning Department has worked with the community and held three meetings with representatives from a variety of community organizations. Through these meetings and in response to comments received, the Planning Department has revised the CPC Rules and Regulations to address many of the initial concerns raised to the Planning Commission.

On July 15, 2021 after hearing the item and closing public comment, this item was continued to August 26, 2021. During the hearing the Commission heard public testimony from 14 members of the public. Public comments received were mainly focused on concerns around the proposed time limits for speakers and time limits on Discretionary Review presentations and rebuttals. Additionally, some members of the Commission and public expressed concern around the previous iteration of the Rules and Regulations where Neighborhood Organizations were required to be established at least 24 months prior to the hearing. The Commission also requested for the Department to look at expanding the definition of neighborhood group organizations. As a result of this request, the Department worked to create a separate community organization registry for the Commissions which would include groups both neighborhood and community based. Additionally, this iteration of the Rules and Regulations eliminated any minimum time requirements for a group's establishment.

## Overview of Edits

Below is an overview of the proposed edits to the CPC Rules and Regulations. Please note that this list does not capture all changes, please reference Attachment A to review all changes.

- **Article 1, Section 2 - Commission:** Action Item 7.1.1 of the Planning Department's Racial and Social Equity Plan Phase 1 called for the review and revision of Rules and Regulations to include inclusive language and to align the Rules and Regulations with the department's Racial and Social Equity Action Plan. Article 1, Section 2 has been added to reflect the Commission's position and to satisfy this action item. Please note, that although similar language already exists in the Charter for all commissions, we felt it was important to include. No additional changes were made to this iteration of the Rules and Regulations.
- **Minor Text Amendments:** Throughout the document non-substantive text amendments have been made. Such text edits include grammatical edits, formatting, edits to clarify existing processes and titles, etc. Some text has been consolidated to be shown in one area versus repeated in each sub-section.

- **Article IV, Section 9 and 10- Order of Business:** Edits to this section are proposed to align with the Commission’s current practice for order of business. Additionally, new text has been added to clarify the current Commission practice possibly moving General Public Comment, in excess of 15 minutes, to the end of the calendar. No additional changes were made to this iteration of the Rules and Regulations.
- **Article V- Amendments:** The proposed edit would clarify and not change the existing process. The proposed edit adds a reference to Charter Section 4.104(a)1. No additional changes were made to this iteration of the Rules and Regulations.
- **Appendix A – Submittals:** The proposed amendments are intended to provide distinction between Commission “packets” and Staff “case reports,” and their respective submittal deadlines. Edits were made to provide flexibility for early submittal of certain cases by removing the two-week requirement currently in place and providing discretion to publish case reports earlier. Furthermore, Commission packet submittal deadlines and contents have been consolidated here, rather than have it repeated in each sub-section. There is also a proposed amendment removing specific plan and graphic submittal requirements. The proposed amendment would call for these submittals to be in accordance with the Planning Department’s Plan Submittal Guidelines (Attachment E) rather than having requirements repeated in both documents. No additional changes were made to this iteration of the Rules and Regulations.
- **Appendix A - Discretionary Review:**
  - Provide requirements for briefs and submittals. No additional changes were made to this iteration of the Rules and Regulations.
  - Updated limits for sponsor and DR Requestor(s) presentations. This iteration of the Rules and Regulations would provide community organizations registered with the Planning Department separate presentation time limits.
    - The Planning Department will maintain a separate community organization registry for the Commissions. There will be no minimum group establishment time requirement.
  - Proposed removal of the rebuttal in recognition of the current practice of the Commission’s clarifying questions to sponsors and/or DR Requestors. The DR rebuttal would remain in instances where the DR Requestor is a community organization registered with the Planning Department.
- **Appendix A—Cases, Mandatory DR, and CEQA Appeals and Negative Declarations:**
  - Updating project sponsor presentation time to reflect current practices. No additional changes were made to this iteration of the Rules and Regulations.
  - Expand the definition of organized opposition to include community organizations registered with the Planning Department.
  - Reflect current practices of reduced speaking times for sponsors, organized opposition and members of the public for items that have already been heard. No additional changes were made to this iteration of the Rules and Regulations.

## **Basis for Recommendation**

The Department finds that these proposed amendments to the CPC Rules and Regulations addresses the requirement of the Planning Department's Racial and Social Equity Plan Phase 1, Action Item 7.1.1. Additionally, this iteration provides procedural amendments that are a result of meetings with community organizations and feedback from the Commission.

## **Attachments:**

Attachment A – Draft Rules and Regulations - Tracked Changes

Attachment B – Draft Rules and Regulations – Clean Version

Attachment C- Comment Letters and emails to the Planning Commission re: Rules and Regulations

Attachment D- Map of Discretionary Review Applications Filed 2015-2020

Attachment E- Planning Department Plan Submittal Guidelines



San Francisco  
**Planning**

**COMMISSION**

# **DRAFT - SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING COMMISSION CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA RULES & REGULATIONS**

## **Article I – NAME COMMISSION**

**Section 1.** The Name of this Commission shall be the “SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING COMMISSION.”

**Section 2.** The San Francisco Planning Commission (hereinafter “Commission”) acknowledges the diverse population of the City and County of San Francisco and reaffirms its commitment to racial and social equity. The Commission recommends that the Mayor and the President of the Board of Supervisors nominate members of the Commission that represent this diversity. The Commission directs the Planning Department (hereinafter “Department”) to ensure the diverse voices of San Francisco are given the opportunity to be heard and represented with reasonable accommodations at all public meetings of the Commission.

## Article II – Officers and Appointments

**Section 1. Officers.** The Officers of this Commission shall consist of a President and a Vice President. The President and Vice President shall be members of the Commission, and shall be elected at the first Regular Meeting of the Commission held on or after the 15th day of January of each year; or at a subsequent Meeting, the date of which shall be fixed by the Commission at the first Regular Meeting on or after the 15th day of January each year. They shall hold office for one year or until their successors are elected.

**Section 2. Election.** The presiding officer takes public comment on the agenda item. Then the presiding officer requests nominations for the office from the members of the body. No second is required under Roberts' Rules of Order. When no additional nominations are offered, the presiding officer closes the nomination. The Commission then votes on the nominations in the order they were received. The first candidate to receive a majority of the votes is elected to the office.

The President and Vice President shall not both be members of the commission appointed by the Mayor or President of the Board of Supervisors. (If one is a Mayoral appointee, the other position must be held by a member appointed by the President of the Board of Supervisors.)-

**Section 3. Planning Director.** The Planning Director shall hold office at the pleasure of the Commission and shall be qualified by training and experience to be the administrative and technical head of the San Francisco Planning Department and of all activities under the jurisdiction of the Planning Commission. An annual performance evaluation by the full Commission may be convened in closed session.

**Section 4. Commission Secretary.** The Commission at any Regular or Special Meeting may appoint a Commission Secretary who shall hold office at the pleasure of the Commission.

## Article III– Duties of Officers

**Section 1. President.** The President shall preside at all meetings of the Commission, shall appoint all Committees and their Chairs, and shall perform all other duties necessary or incidental to the office. The President shall attend all Meetings of bodies of which, by the Charter, he or she is made an ex-officio member, or shall designate the Planning Director or any member of the Commission to attend such Meetings in the place and stead of the President.

**Section 2. Vice President.** In the event of the absence or inability to act of the President, the Vice President shall take the place and perform the duties of the President. In the event of absence or inability to act of both the President and Vice President, the remaining members of the Commission shall elect one of their members to act temporarily as President, by a majority vote of the remaining Commissioners.

## Article IV – Meetings

**Section 1.** **Regular Meetings.** Regular Meetings of the Commission shall be open and public and shall be held each Thursday of each month except in any month where there are five (5) Thursdays. Where there are five (5) Thursdays in a month, the fifth Thursday of the month shall be cancelled, unless otherwise adopted as part of the Hearing Schedule. All Regular Meetings of the San Francisco Planning Commission shall not start before 12:00 noon, unless otherwise noticed on the printed calendar at least 72 hours in advance of a scheduled hearing.

The San Francisco Planning Commission does hereby designate Room 400 of City Hall, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, San Francisco, California, as its regular meeting location unless otherwise noticed on the calendar at least 72 hours in advance of a scheduled hearing, or if the need arises because room capacity for Room 400 is anticipated to be exceeded. Provided that where matters of special concern to certain areas or districts of the City are to be considered, a Meeting place may be designated in the City and County within such areas or districts.

The Commission Secretary will present to the Commission on or before the first Regular Meeting day of the year (or subsequent date as stipulated by the Commission), ~~a list~~ for consideration and indication of adoption by voice vote, the Commission’s Hearing Schedule for the calendar year, including possible cancellation dates of Regular Meetings to accommodate a summer hiatus of no more than 3 weeks and various holidays throughout the year.

**Section 2.** **Special Meetings.** Special Meetings of the Commission shall be open and public and shall be held at such times as the Commission may determine. Special meetings may be called by the President for any time, and must be called by the President upon the written request of three members of the Commission, filed with the Administrative Commission Secretary. The Place of such Meetings shall be as provided above for Regular Meetings.

**Section 3.** **Notice.** Notice<sup>1</sup> of the time and place of every Regular Meeting of the Commission shall be given to members of the Commission at least 72 hours before the time of such Meeting, and shall be given by posting and otherwise, as required by San Francisco Administrative Code Section 67.7 and California Government Code Section 54954.2. Notice of the time and place of every Special Meeting of the Commission shall be given to members of the Commission at least 72 hours before the time of such Meetings, and shall be given by posting and otherwise, as required by San Francisco Administrative Code Section 67.6(f) and California Government Code Section 54956. The Commission shall not consider ~~nor~~ act upon any matter at any Regular Meeting except upon (1) written notice thereof as required by this Section 3, or (2) a condition exists that requires emergency action as set forth in San Francisco Administrative

<sup>1</sup> The San Francisco Administrative Code, Chapter 67 “The San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance of 1999,” Section 67.7 stipulates that policy bodies shall post an agenda containing a meaningful description of each item of business to be transacted or discussed at the meeting at least 72 hours before a regular meeting and that it shall post a current agenda on its Internet site at least 72 hours before a regular meeting. Therefore, the term “notice” shall refer to both written and electronic formats

Code Section 67.7(e) and California Government Code Section 54954.2(b). No matter shall be considered at any Special Meeting unless included in the Notice calling such meeting.

**Section 4.** **Cancellation or Change of Regular Meetings.** If the Regular Meeting day falls on a legal holiday, or if a recommendation is made by the Director that a Regular Meeting be cancelled or changed, the Commission or the President may cancel the Regular Meeting or fix another time therefor. Notice of cancellation or of a change in a Regular Meeting time must be given at least seventy-two hours before the scheduled time of such Meeting, unless the cancellation is due to an emergency and seventy-two hour notice is not possible.

**Section 5.** **Quorum.** A quorum for the transaction of official business at any Regular or Special Meeting shall consist of a majority of all members of the Commission, but a smaller number may adjourn from time to time and may compel the attendance of absent members in the manner and subject to the penalties, if any, provided by law.

**Section 6.** **Voting.**

a. *Procedural Matters.* Pursuant to Charter [Section 4.104](#), with respect to matters of procedure the Commission may act by the affirmative vote of a majority of the members present, so long as the members present constitute a quorum.

b. Except as provided in subsection “(a)” above, every Official Act taken by the Commission, including, but not limited to, those based on its jurisdiction derived from the Planning Code, Chapter 31 of the Administrative Code, the Subdivision Code and Discretionary Review Powers of the Commission, may be by “Motion” or “Resolution” adopted by a majority vote of all members of the Commission (four (4) votes). All members present shall vote for or against each question brought to a vote unless a member is excused from voting by a conflict of interest or a motion adopted by a majority of the members present.

A motion that receives less than four votes is a failed motion resulting in disapproval of the action requested to be taken by the Commission unless a substitute motion for a continuance or other action is adopted. (For example: a request for Conditional Use requires four votes to approve; failure to receive the four votes results in denial of the conditional use. A request for Discretionary Review requires four votes to take discretionary review and modify the project; failure to receive four votes results in approval of the proposed project without modification. Planning Code [Section 302\(c\)](#) sets forth the requirements for Commission determinations regarding Planning Code amendments. Planning Code [Section 340\(d\)](#) sets forth the requirements for Commission determinations regarding General Plan amendments.)

A motion of intent occurs when the Commission passes a motion by a majority of all members of the Commission that is contrary to the preliminary recommendation of the Planning Department staff and the Commission does not have findings that support the intended action. Any Commissioner absent from participation in the motion of intent must be provided all relevant case material and hearing tapes for review prior to a scheduled hearing for consideration of the final motion.



c. Once the Commission holds the public hearing on a permit application, receives all public testimony and declares that it is ready to consider approval or disapproval of the application, the applicant shall not be permitted to withdraw the application, except with the consent of the Commission. In the event that the Commission passes any motion of intent to approve or disapprove a permit application before them, the applicant shall not be permitted to withdraw the application prior to the Commission's completion of their action with passage of a written "Motion" with findings or a resolution.

d. Once the Commission holds a public hearing on a matter before them, enters into deliberation and a motion for action is made and receives a second prior to the end of discussion, a request for "call the question" by any member other than the President or Chair would be addressed as follows: The request for "call the question" is considered a motion to halt discussion and must have a second to proceed. If the motion does not receive a second, the motion ~~does fails~~ and discussion resumes on the matter on the floor prior to the motion to "call the question." If the motion receives a second then a vote must be taken immediately and passed by a majority of those present.

**Section 7. Jurisdiction.** Pursuant to Charter [Section 4.105](#), the Commission has the jurisdiction to approve prior to issuance "[all] permits and licenses dependent on, or affected by, the Planning Code administered by the Planning Department." Acting under this section, the Commission may, ~~at-in~~ its discretion, by a majority vote of the Commission (four votes), request ~~S~~staff to bring before it for review any such permit or license that has not yet been issued even if the application has been approved by the Commission or Department staff and forwarded to the Central Permit Bureau. The Commission loses jurisdiction upon either the City's issuance of the permit or license, or a valid appeal has been filed to an appellate body.

**Section 8. Parliamentary Procedure.** The rules of parliamentary practice, as set forth in Robert's Rules of Order, shall govern all meetings of the Commission except as otherwise provided herein.

**Section 9. Order of Business.** The order of business at any Regular Meeting may be as follows:

1. Roll Call
- ~~1.2.~~ [Items Proposed for Continuance](#)
- ~~2.3.~~ Consent Calendar
- ~~3.4.~~ Commission Matters
- ~~4.~~ ~~Action Item List~~
5. Department Matters
6. [General](#) Public Comment – 15 Minutes
7. Regular Calendar
8. Discretionary Review Calendar
- ~~9.~~ ~~Public Comment~~
- ~~10.9.~~ ~~\_\_\_\_\_~~ Adjournment

The President (or Chair) may change the order of business as determined necessary for the Planning Commission to conduct its business effectively.

**Section 10.** **General Public Comment.** The item at each Regular Meeting shall provide an opportunity for members of the public to address the Commission on items of interest to the public that are within the subject matter jurisdiction of the Commission, but which are not on the posted agenda for that Meeting. When that item is reached, members of the public may address the Commission for up to three (3) minutes. The President (or Chair) may limit the total testimony by all members of the public to fifteen (15) minutes. After fifteen minutes of General Public Comment, the President (or Chair) may move the remainder of General Public Comment to the end of the Agenda.

**Section 11.** **Consent Calendar:** Items may be placed on a Consent Calendar section of the Meeting Agenda. Items on the Consent Calendar may be approved by a single vote for all items. Any Commissioner, any member of the public, or the Director may request that the item be taken off the Consent Calendar and placed on the Regular agenda-Calendar for that Commission Hearing or a later hearing.

**Section 12.** **Submittals:** Procedure for submission of material related to any matter that comes before the Commission for their consideration is addressed in Appendix A attached to this document.

**Section 13.** **Hearing Procedures:** At either a Regular or Special Meeting, a public hearing may be held before the Commission on any matter that is on the posted agenda of such Meeting. The procedure for such public hearings is addressed in Appendix A attached to this document.

**Section 14.** **Record.** A record shall be kept of each Regular and Special Meeting by the Commission Secretary or by an Acting Secretary designated by the Commission Secretary.

**Section 15.** **Private Transcription.** The President may authorize any person to transcribe the proceedings of a Regular or Special Meeting provided that the President may require that a copy of such transcript be provided for the Commission's permanent records.

**Section 16.** **Accessibility.** Per the American Disabilities Act and the Language Access Ordinance, the Commission shall provide interpretation or translation services as requested at least 48 hours in advance of a meeting or hearing.

## Article V – Amendments

**Section 1.** These Rules and Regulations may be amended by the Commission at any Regular Meeting by a majority vote following a public hearing. -, providing that the amendment has been calendared for hearing for at least ten days. Pursuant to Charter Section 4.104(a)1, no rule or regulation shall be adopted, amended or repealed, without a public hearing. At least ten days' public notice shall be given for such public hearing.

**Amended:** August 1, 1957  
January 12, 1961  
October 11, 1961

March 26, 1964  
April 23, 1964  
October 29, 1964  
June 17, 1965  
October 24, 1968  
January 18, 1973  
March 1974  
August 8, 1974  
December 11, 1975  
June 24, 1976  
October 28, 1982  
April 19, 1984  
March 19, 1987  
July 28, 1988  
January 20, 1994  
February 2, 1995  
February 16, 1995  
September 28, 1995  
January 25, 1996  
January 21, 1999  
October 19, 2000  
November 18, 2004  
February 10, 2005  
August 4, 2005  
April 17, 2008  
August 4, 2011  
December 19, 2013  
July 2, 2015  
June-August XX, 2021

**Attachment:** Appendix A



# APPENDIX A OF SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING COMMISSION RULES & REGULATIONS

## Submittals and Hearing Procedures:

### A. Submittals

Correspondence submitted to the Planning Commission in advance of a hearing must be received by the Commission Secretary no later than the close of business the day before a hearing for it to become a part of the public record for any public hearing.

Correspondence submitted to the Planning Commission on the same day, must be submitted at the hearing directly to the Planning Commission Secretary. Correspondence submitted in any other fashion on the same day may not become a part of the public record until the following hearing.

Correspondence sent directly to all members of the Commission, must include a copy to the Commission Secretary ([commissions.secretary@sfgov.org](mailto:commissions.secretary@sfgov.org)) for it to become a part of the public record.

For sponsor and/or opposition briefs to be included in the packet forwarded to the Planning Commission in advance of a hearing, ~~15~~ hardcopies and a .pdf copy must be provided to the ~~staff planner no later than the close of business~~ ~~noon~~ Office of Commission Affairs ~~no later than the close of business~~ eight days in advance of the hearing. Generally, 5 pm Wednesdays.

~~Generally, 5 p.m. Wednesdays. Project Sponsor, DR requestors and the public must consult with Staff on their submittal deadlines to be included in as part of staff case reports.~~

Submittals, including staff reports, are due to the Commission one week in advance of the hearing. At the discretion of the Planning Director and/or Planning Commission Officers, staff reports for specific cases may be due earlier. Required plans and graphics shall be in compliance with the Planning Department’s “Plan Submittal Guidelines.” -For projects subject to the California Environmental Quality Act, environmental and historic resource documents should be attached to all submittals.

:

These submittal rules and deadlines shall be strictly enforced and no exceptions shall be made without a vote of the Commission.

## B. Discretionary Review (DR)

### I. Submittals:

~~a. Briefs shall not exceed six single-sided pages, double-spaced, having margins no smaller than one inch, and feature font sizes no smaller than 12 point, along with an unlimited number of exhibits.~~

~~a.b. Content of submittals should be as follows: include a sStaff cover memo attached to DR application and Project Sponsor Response.~~

~~b. Abbreviated:~~

- ~~• Staff cover memo attached to DR application and Project Sponsor response;~~
- ~~• Plans in compliance with the Planning Department's “,”~~
- ~~• Color streetscape of both sides of street;~~
- ~~• Digital photographs of existing conditions;~~

~~c. Full:~~

- ~~• Same as stated in Abbreviated above; with~~
- ~~• 3-D Renderings;~~

~~—~~

- ~~• Environmental and historic resource documents to be attached to all submittals.~~

### II. Hearing Procedures:

~~a. A thorough description of the issue by the Director or a member of the Sstaff.~~

~~b. A presentation by the DR Requestor(s) team (includes Requestor(s) or their designee, lawyers, architects, engineers, expeditors, and/or other advisors) would be for a period not to exceed five three (35) minutes for each requestor. When the DR applicant Requestor is a neighborhood community organization registered with the Planning Department group Organization (defined as a neighborhood group that (a) has been in existence for 24 months prior to the request, and (b) is listed as a with the Planning Department) a five (5) minute presentation is allotted along with a two (2) minute rebuttal.~~

~~c. Testimony by members of the public in support of the DR would be for up to three (3) minutes each.~~

~~d.c. A presentation by the Project Sponsor(s) team (includes Sponsor(s) or their designee, lawyers, architects, engineers, expeditors, and/or other advisors) would be for a period up to five three (35) minutes, but could be extended for a period not to exceed to 10 five (5) minutes if there are multiple DR requestors.~~

~~e.d. Testimony by members of the public in support of the project would be for up to three (3) minutes each.~~

~~f. DR requestor(s) or their designees are given two (2) minutes for rebuttal.~~

~~g. Project sponsor(s) or their designees are given two (2) minutes for rebuttal.~~

~~h.e. The President (or Acting Chair) may impose time limits on appearances by all persons, including members of the public, and may otherwise exercise his or her discretion on procedures for the conduct of public hearings.~~

## III. Other:

- ~~a. Revisions should be submitted to Sstaff and DR requestors by 5pm Tuesday (two days) before the Thursday Hearing.~~

Revisions submitted at hearing are discouraged and will only be considered at the Commission's discretion.

~~C. Mandatory Discretionary Review (Dwelling Unit Removal; Medical Cannabis Dispensary)~~~~D.C.~~~~I. Submittals:~~

- ~~a. Submittals, including staff packets, are due to the Commission one week in advance.~~

~~II. Hearing Procedures:~~

- a. A thorough description of the issue by the Director or ~~a member of the~~ Sstaff.
- b. A presentation by the Project Sponsor(s) team (~~includes~~ Sponsor(s) or their designee, lawyers, architects, engineers, expeditors, and/or other advisors) ~~would be for a period~~ not to exceed five (5) minutes. ~~For items that have already been heard, the Project Sponsor shall~~ may be limited to not to exceed three (3) minutes.
- c. Testimony by members of the public ~~would be for~~ up to three (3) minutes each. For items that have already been heard, the President may limit such public testimony to a shorter time period.
- d. The President (or ~~Acting~~ Chair) may impose time limits on appearances by all persons, including members of the public, and may otherwise exercise his or her discretion on procedures for the conduct of public hearings.

~~E.D. Cases (Conditional Use (CU); Office Allocation (321); Downtown Project (309); Draft EIRs, etc.):~~~~I. Submittals:~~

- ~~a. Staff packet due to Commission one week in advance of hearing; or  
At the discretion of the Planning Director and Planning Commission Officers, two weeks in advance of hearing.~~

~~II. Content of submittals should be as follows:~~

- ~~a. Plans in compliance with the Planning Department's "Plan Submittal Guidelines;"  
b. Color streetscape of both sides of street;  
c. Digital photographs of existing conditions;  
d. 3-D digital renderings; and  
e. Environmental and historic resource documents to be attached to all submittals.~~

~~III. Hearing Procedures:~~

- a. A thorough description of the issue(s) by the Director or ~~a member of the~~ sStaff.
- b. A presentation of the proposal by the Project Sponsor(s) team (~~includes~~ sponsor or their designee, lawyers, architects, engineers, expeditors, and/or other advisors) ~~would be for a period~~ not to exceed five (5) minutes, not to exceed 10 minutes, unless a written request for extension not to exceed a total presentation time of 105 minutes is received at least 72 hours

in advance of the hearing, through the Commission Secretary, and granted by the President (or Chair). ~~For items that have already been heard, the Project Sponsor may be limited to three (3) minutes.~~

- c. A presentation of opposition to the proposal by organized opposition ~~for a period (defined as a neighborhood community organization registered with the Planning Department) group that (a) has been in existence for 24 months prior to the request, and (b) is listed as a registered neighborhood organization with the Planning Department) not to exceed 10 minutes (or a period equal to that provided to the project sponsor team)~~ with a minimum of three (3) speakers), not to exceed 10 minutes. The intent of the 10 minute block of time provided to organized opposition is to reduce the number of overall speakers who are part of the organized opposition. The requestor should advise the group that the Commission would expect the organized presentation to represent their testimony, if granted. Organized opposition will be recognized only upon written application at least 72 hours in advance of the hearing, through the Commission Secretary, the President or Chair. Such application should identify the community organization(s) and speakers. For items that have already been heard, testimony from organized opposition may be limited to three (3) minutes.
- d. Public testimony from individuals not to exceed three (3) minutes each. For items that have already been heard, the President (or Chair) may limit such public testimony to a shorter time period.
- ~~e. Director's preliminary recommendation must be prepared in writing.~~
- ~~f.e.~~ Action by the Commission on the matter before it.
- ~~g.f.~~ In public hearings on Draft Environmental Impact Reports, public testimony from individuals not to exceed three (3) minutes each will be provided~~testimony by members of the public will be provided for up to three (3) minutes each. For items that have already been heard, the President (or Chair) may limit such public testimony to a shorter period. all speakers will be limited to a period not to exceed three (3) minutes.~~
- ~~g.~~ The President (or ~~Acting~~ Chair) may impose time limits on appearances by all persons, including members of the public, and may otherwise exercise his or her discretion on procedures for the conduct of public hearings.
- h. Amendment(s) to motions should be read into the record before the vote is taken.

IV.II. Other:

- ~~a. Revisions should be submitted to Staff by 5pm Tuesday (two days) before the Thursday Hearing.~~  
Revisions submitted at hearing are discouraged and will only be considered at the Commission's discretion.

~~F.~~ **Policy or Major Project Informational Presentations**

~~G.~~

Submittals:  
Staff packet due to Commission one week in advance of hearing; or

~~E.~~

- ~~a. At the discretion of the Planning Director and Planning Commission Officers, two weeks in advance of hearing.~~

**H.I.** Hearing Procedures:

- a. An introduction of the item or issue by the Director or ~~a member of the S~~staff.
- b. A presentation of the item or issue by ~~S~~staff or the issuing agency ~~for a period~~ not to exceed 20 minutes.
- c. Public testimony from individuals not to exceed three (3) minutes each. The President (or ~~Acting~~Chair) may impose time limits on appearances by all persons, including members of the public, and may otherwise exercise his or her discretion on procedures for the conduct of public hearings.

**H.II.** Other:

- ~~a. Revisions should be submitted to staff by 5pm Tuesday (two days) before the Thursday Hearing.~~

Revisions submitted at hearing are discouraged and will only be considered at the Commission's discretion.

**H.F.** CEQA Appeals of Negative Declarations~~I.~~ Submittals:

- ~~a. Staff packet due to Commission one week in advance of hearing; or~~
- ~~b. At the discretion of the Planning Director and Planning Commission Officers, two weeks in advance of hearing.~~

**H.I.** Hearing Procedures:

- a. A thorough description of the issue by the Director or ~~a member of the S~~staff
- b. A presentation by the Appellant(s) team (includes appellant or their designee, lawyers, architects, engineers, expeditors, and/or other advisors) ~~would be for a period~~ not to exceed ten (10) minutes. For items that have already been heard, Appellants may be limited to three (3) minutes.
- c. A presentation by the Project Sponsor(s) team (includes sponsor or their designee, lawyers, architects, engineers, expeditors, and/or other advisors) ~~would be for a period~~ not to exceed ten (10) minutes. For items that have already been heard, the Project Sponsor may be limited to three (3) minutes.
- d. Public testimony from individuals not to exceed three (3) minutes each ~~Testimony by members of the public would be for up to three (3) minutes each. For items that have already been heard, the President (or Chair) may limit such public testimony to a shorter period.~~
- d. The President (or ~~Acting~~Chair) may impose time limits on appearances by all persons, including members of the public, and may otherwise exercise his or her discretion on procedures for the conduct of public hearings.
- e. Amendment(s) to motions should be read back into the record at the same hearing ~~before the vote is taken.~~

**NOTE:**

The Commission strongly discourages members of the public, project sponsors, architects, lawyers, etc. to cross the railing that separates the Commission and ~~S~~staff from the public



seating area to engage in conversation with ~~S~~staff or the members of the Commission while a meeting is in session.

**AMENDED:** ~~June August XX, 2021 July 2, 2015~~



**San Francisco  
Planning**

**COMMISSION**

## **DRAFT - SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING COMMISSION CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA RULES & REGULATIONS**

### **Article I – COMMISSION**

**Section 1.** The Name of this Commission shall be the “SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING COMMISSION.”

**Section 2.** The San Francisco Planning Commission (hereinafter “Commission”) acknowledges the diverse population of the City and County of San Francisco and reaffirms its commitment to racial and social equity. The Commission recommends that the Mayor and the President of the Board of Supervisors nominate members of the Commission that represent this diversity. The Commission directs the Planning Department (hereinafter “Department”) to ensure the diverse voices of San Francisco are given the opportunity to be heard and represented with reasonable accommodations at all public meetings of the Commission.

## Article II – Officers and Appointments

**Section 1.** **Officers.** The Officers of this Commission shall consist of a President and a Vice President. The President and Vice President shall be members of the Commission, and shall be elected at the first Regular Meeting of the Commission held on or after the 15th day of January of each year; or at a subsequent Meeting, the date of which shall be fixed by the Commission at the first Regular Meeting on or after the 15th day of January each year. They shall hold office for one year or until their successors are elected.

**Section 2.** **Election.** The presiding officer takes public comment on the agenda item. Then the presiding officer requests nominations for the office from the members of the body. No second is required under Roberts' Rules of Order. When no additional nominations are offered, the presiding officer closes the nomination. The Commission then votes on the nominations in the order they were received. The first candidate to receive a majority of the votes is elected to the office.

The President and Vice President shall not both be members of the commission appointed by the Mayor or President of the Board of Supervisors. (If one is a Mayoral appointee, the other position must be held by a member appointed by the President of the Board of Supervisors.)

**Section 3.** **Planning Director.** The Planning Director shall hold office at the pleasure of the Commission and shall be qualified by training and experience to be the administrative and technical head of the San Francisco Planning Department and of all activities under the jurisdiction of the Planning Commission. An annual performance evaluation by the full Commission may be convened in closed session.

**Section 4.** **Commission Secretary.** The Commission at any Regular or Special Meeting may appoint a Commission Secretary who shall hold office at the pleasure of the Commission.

## Article III– Duties of Officers

**Section 1.** **President.** The President shall preside at all meetings of the Commission, shall appoint all Committees and their Chairs, and shall perform all other duties necessary or incidental to the office. The President shall attend all Meetings of bodies of which, by the Charter, he or she is made an ex-officio member, or shall designate the Planning Director or any member of the Commission to attend such Meetings in the place and stead of the President.

**Section 2.** **Vice President.** In the event of the absence or inability to act of the President, the Vice President shall take the place and perform the duties of the President. In the event of absence or inability to act of both the President and Vice President, the remaining members of the Commission shall elect one of their members to act temporarily as President, by a majority vote of the remaining Commissioners.

## Article IV – Meetings

**Section 1.** **Regular Meetings.** Regular Meetings of the Commission shall be open and public and shall be held each Thursday of each month except in any month where there are five (5) Thursdays. Where there are five (5) Thursdays in a month, the fifth Thursday of the month shall be cancelled, unless otherwise adopted as part of the Hearing Schedule. All Regular Meetings of the San Francisco Planning Commission shall not start before 12:00 noon, unless otherwise noticed on the printed calendar at least 72 hours in advance of a scheduled hearing.

The San Francisco Planning Commission does hereby designate Room 400 of City Hall, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, San Francisco, California, as its regular meeting location unless otherwise noticed on the calendar at least 72 hours in advance of a scheduled hearing, or if the need arises because room capacity for Room 400 is anticipated to be exceeded. Provided that where matters of special concern to certain areas or districts of the City are to be considered, a Meeting place may be designated in the City and County within such areas or districts.

The Commission Secretary will present to the Commission on or before the first Regular Meeting day of the year (or subsequent date as stipulated by the Commission), for consideration and indication of adoption by voice vote, the Commission’s Hearing Schedule for the calendar year, including possible cancellation dates of Regular Meetings to accommodate a summer hiatus of no more than 3 weeks and various holidays throughout the year.

**Section 2.** **Special Meetings.** Special Meetings of the Commission shall be open and public and shall be held at such times as the Commission may determine. Special meetings may be called by the President for any time, and must be called by the President upon the written request of three members of the Commission, filed with the Commission Secretary. The Place of such Meetings shall be as provided above for Regular Meetings.

**Section 3.** **Notice.** Notice<sup>1</sup> of the time and place of every Regular Meeting of the Commission shall be given to members of the Commission at least 72 hours before the time of such Meeting, and shall be given by posting and otherwise, as required by San Francisco Administrative Code [Section 67.7](#) and California Government Code Section 54954.2. Notice of the time and place of every Special Meeting of the Commission shall be given to members of the Commission at least 72 hours before the time of such Meetings, and shall be given by posting and otherwise, as required by San Francisco Administrative Code Section 67.6(f) and California Government Code Section 54956. The Commission shall not consider or act upon any matter at any Regular Meeting except upon (1) written notice thereof as required by this Section 3, or (2) a condition exists that requires emergency action as set forth in San Francisco Administrative

---

<sup>1</sup> The San Francisco Administrative Code, Chapter 67 “The San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance of 1999,” Section 67.7 stipulates that policy bodies shall post an agenda containing a meaningful description of each item of business to be transacted or discussed at the meeting at least 72 hours before a regular meeting and that it shall post a current agenda on its Internet site at least 72 hours before a regular meeting. Therefore, the term “notice” shall refer to both written and electronic formats

Code Section 67.7(e) and California Government Code Section 54954.2(b). No matter shall be considered at any Special Meeting unless included in the Notice calling such meeting.

**Section 4.** **Cancellation or Change of Regular Meetings.** If the Regular Meeting day falls on a legal holiday, or if a recommendation is made by the Director that a Regular Meeting be cancelled or changed, the Commission or the President may cancel the Regular Meeting or fix another time therefor. Notice of cancellation or of a change in a Regular Meeting time must be given at least seventy-two hours before the scheduled time of such Meeting, unless the cancellation is due to an emergency and seventy-two hour notice is not possible.

**Section 5.** **Quorum.** A quorum for the transaction of official business at any Regular or Special Meeting shall consist of a majority of all members of the Commission, but a smaller number may adjourn from time to time and may compel the attendance of absent members in the manner and subject to the penalties, if any, provided by law.

**Section 6.** **Voting.**

a. *Procedural Matters.* Pursuant to Charter [Section 4.104](#), with respect to matters of procedure the Commission may act by the affirmative vote of a majority of the members present, so long as the members present constitute a quorum.

b. Except as provided in subsection (a) above, every Official Act taken by the Commission, including, but not limited to, those based on its jurisdiction derived from the Planning Code, Chapter 31 of the Administrative Code, the Subdivision Code and Discretionary Review Powers of the Commission, may be by “Motion” or “Resolution” adopted by a majority vote of all members of the Commission (four (4) votes). All members present shall vote for or against each question brought to a vote unless a member is excused from voting by a conflict of interest or a motion adopted by a majority of the members present.

A motion that receives less than four votes is a failed motion resulting in disapproval of the action requested to be taken by the Commission unless a substitute motion for a continuance or other action is adopted. (For example: a request for Conditional Use requires four votes to approve; failure to receive the four votes results in denial of the conditional use. A request for Discretionary Review requires four votes to take discretionary review and modify the project; failure to receive four votes results in approval of the proposed project without modification. Planning Code [Section 302\(c\)](#) sets forth the requirements for Commission determinations regarding Planning Code amendments. Planning Code [Section 340\(d\)](#) sets forth the requirements for Commission determinations regarding General Plan amendments.)

A motion of intent occurs when the Commission passes a motion by a majority of all members of the Commission that is contrary to the preliminary recommendation of the Planning Department staff and the Commission does not have findings that support the intended action. Any Commissioner absent from participation in the motion of intent must be provided all relevant case material and hearing tapes for review prior to a scheduled hearing for consideration of the final motion.

c. Once the Commission holds the public hearing on a permit application, receives all public testimony and declares that it is ready to consider approval or disapproval of the application, the applicant shall not be permitted to withdraw the application, except with the consent of the Commission. In the event that the Commission passes any motion of intent to approve or disapprove a permit application before them, the applicant shall not be permitted to withdraw the application prior to the Commission's completion of their action with passage of a written "Motion" with findings or a resolution.

d. Once the Commission holds a public hearing on a matter before them, enters into deliberation and a motion for action is made and receives a second prior to the end of discussion, a request for "call the question" by any member other than the President or Chair would be addressed as follows: The request for "call the question" is considered a motion to halt discussion and must have a second to proceed. If the motion does not receive a second, the motion fails and discussion resumes on the matter on the floor prior to the motion to "call the question." If the motion receives a second then a vote must be taken immediately and passed by a majority of those present.

**Section 7.** **Jurisdiction.** Pursuant to Charter [Section 4.105](#), the Commission has the jurisdiction to approve prior to issuance "[all] permits and licenses dependent on, or affected by, the Planning Code administered by the Planning Department." Acting under this section, the Commission may, in its discretion, by a majority vote of the Commission (four votes), request Staff to bring before it for review any such permit or license that has not yet been issued even if the application has been approved by the Commission or Department staff and forwarded to the Central Permit Bureau. The Commission loses jurisdiction upon either the City's issuance of the permit or license, or a valid appeal has been filed to an appellate body.

**Section 8.** **Parliamentary Procedure.** The rules of parliamentary practice, as set forth in Robert's Rules of Order, shall govern all meetings of the Commission except as otherwise provided herein.

**Section 9.** **Order of Business.** The order of business at any Regular Meeting may be as follows:

1. Roll Call
2. Items Proposed for Continuance
3. Consent Calendar
4. Commission Matters
5. Department Matters
6. General Public Comment – 15 Minutes
7. Regular Calendar
8. Discretionary Review Calendar
9. Adjournment

The President (or Chair) may change the order of business as determined necessary for the Planning Commission to conduct its business effectively.

**Section 10.** **General Public Comment.** The item at each Regular Meeting shall provide an opportunity for members of the public to address the Commission on items of interest to the public that

are within the subject matter jurisdiction of the Commission, but which are not on the posted agenda for that Meeting. When that item is reached, members of the public may address the Commission for up to three (3) minutes. The President (or Chair) may limit the total testimony by all members of the public to fifteen (15) minutes. After fifteen minutes of General Public Comment, the President (or Chair) may move the remainder of General Public Comment to the end of the Agenda.

- Section 11.** **Consent Calendar:** Items may be placed on a Consent Calendar section of the Meeting Agenda. Items on the Consent Calendar may be approved by a single vote for all items. Any Commissioner, any member of the public, or the Director may request that the item be taken off the Consent Calendar and placed on the Regular Calendar for that Commission Hearing or a later hearing.
- Section 12.** **Submittals:** Procedure for submission of material related to any matter that comes before the Commission for their consideration is addressed in Appendix A attached to this document.
- Section 13.** **Hearing Procedures:** At either a Regular or Special Meeting, a public hearing may be held before the Commission on any matter that is on the posted agenda of such Meeting. The procedure for such public hearings is addressed in Appendix A attached to this document.
- Section 14.** **Record.** A record shall be kept of each Regular and Special Meeting by the Commission Secretary or by an Acting Secretary designated by the Commission Secretary.
- Section 15.** **Private Transcription.** The President may authorize any person to transcribe the proceedings of a Regular or Special Meeting provided that the President may require that a copy of such transcript be provided for the Commission's permanent records.
- Section 16.** **Accessibility.** Per the American Disabilities Act and the Language Access Ordinance, the Commission shall provide interpretation or translation services as requested at least 48 hours in advance of a meeting or hearing.

## Article V – Amendments

- Section 1.** These Rules and Regulations may be amended by the Commission at any Regular Meeting by a majority vote following a public hearing. Pursuant to Charter [Section 4.104\(a\)1](#), no rule or regulation shall be adopted, amended or repealed, without a public hearing. At least ten days' public notice shall be given for such public hearing.

**Amended:** August 1, 1957  
 January 12, 1961  
 October 11, 1961  
 March 26, 1964  
 April 23, 1964  
 October 29, 1964  
 June 17, 1965

October 24, 1968  
January 18, 1973  
March 1974  
August 8, 1974  
December 11, 1975  
June 24, 1976  
October 28, 1982  
April 19, 1984  
March 19, 1987  
July 28, 1988  
January 20, 1994  
February 2, 1995  
February 16, 1995  
September 28, 1995  
January 25, 1996  
January 21, 1999  
October 19, 2000  
November 18, 2004  
February 10, 2005  
August 4, 2005  
April 17, 2008  
August 4, 2011  
December 19, 2013  
July 2, 2015  
August XX, 2021

**Attachment:** Appendix A





## APPENDIX A

# OF SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING COMMISSION RULES & REGULATIONS

### Submittals and Hearing Procedures:

#### A. Submittals

Correspondence submitted to the Planning Commission in advance of a hearing must be received by the Commission Secretary no later than the close of business the day before a hearing for it to become a part of the public record for any public hearing.

Correspondence submitted to the Planning Commission on the same day must be submitted at the hearing directly to the Planning Commission Secretary. Correspondence submitted in any other fashion on the same day may not become a part of the public record until the following hearing.

Correspondence sent directly to all members of the Commission, must include a copy to the Commission Secretary ([commissions.secretary@sfgov.org](mailto:commissions.secretary@sfgov.org)) for it to become a part of the public record.

For sponsor and/or opposition briefs to be included in the packet forwarded to the Planning Commission in advance of a hearing, hardcopies and a .pdf copy must be provided to the Office of Commission Affairs no later than the close of business eight days in advance of the hearing. Generally, 5 pm Wednesdays.

Project Sponsor, DR requestors and the public must consult with Staff on their submittal deadlines to be included as part of staff case reports.

Submittals, including staff reports, are due to the Commission one week in advance of the hearing. At the discretion of the Planning Director and/or Planning Commission Officers, staff reports for specific cases may be due earlier. Required plans and graphics shall be in compliance with the Planning Department's "[Plan Submittal Guidelines.](#)" For projects subject to the California Environmental Quality Act, environmental and historic resource documents should be attached to all submittals.

These submittal rules and deadlines shall be strictly enforced and no exceptions shall be made without

a vote of the Commission.

**B. Discretionary Review (DR)**

I. Submittals:

- a. Briefs shall not exceed six single-sided pages, double-spaced, having margins no smaller than one inch, and feature font sizes no smaller than 12 point, along with an unlimited number of exhibits.
- b. Content of submittals should include a staff cover memo attached to DR application and Project Sponsor Response.

II. Hearing Procedures:

- a. A thorough description of the issue by the Director or Staff.
- b. A presentation by the DR Requestor(s) team (Requestor(s) or their designee, lawyers, architects, engineers, expeditors, and/or other advisors) not to exceed three (3) minutes for each requestor. When the DR Requestor is a community organization registered with the Planning Department ~~Organization~~ a five (5) minute presentation is allotted along with a two (2) minute rebuttal.
- c. A presentation by the Project Sponsor(s) team (Sponsor(s) or their designee, lawyers, architects, engineers, expeditors, and/or other advisors) for up to three (3) minutes, but could be extended to five (5) minutes if there are multiple DR requestors.
- d. Testimony by members of the public for up to three (3) minutes each.
- e. The President (or Chair) may impose time limits on appearances by all persons, including members of the public, and may otherwise exercise his or her discretion on procedures for the conduct of public hearings.

III. Other

Revisions submitted at hearing are discouraged and will only be considered at the Commission's discretion.

**C. Mandatory Discretionary Review**

I. Hearing Procedures:

- a. A thorough description of the issue by the Director or Staff.
- b. A presentation by the Project Sponsor(s) team (Sponsor(s) or their designee, lawyers, architects, engineers, expeditors, and/or other advisors) not to exceed five (5) minutes. For items that have already been heard, the Project Sponsor may be limited to three (3) minutes.
- c. Testimony by members of the public for up to three (3) minutes each. For items that have already been heard, the President may limit such public testimony to a shorter time period.
- d. The President (or Chair) may impose time limits on appearances by all persons, including members of the public, and may otherwise exercise his or her discretion on procedures for the conduct of public hearings.

**D. Cases ([Conditional Use \(CU\)](#); [Office Allocation \(321\)](#); [Downtown Project \(309\)](#); Draft EIRs, etc.):**

- I. Hearing Procedures:
  - a. A thorough description of the issue(s) by the Director or Staff.
  - b. A presentation of the proposal by the Project Sponsor(s) team (sponsor or their designee, lawyers, architects, engineers, expeditors, and/or other advisors) not to exceed five (5) minutes, unless a written request for extension not to exceed a total presentation time of 10 minutes is received at least 72 hours in advance of the hearing, through the Commission Secretary, and granted by the President (or Chair). For items that have already been heard, the Project Sponsor may be limited to three (3) minutes.
  - c. A presentation of opposition to the proposal by organized opposition (defined as a community organization registered with the Planning Department with a minimum of three (3) speakers)), not to exceed 10 minutes. The intent of the 10 minute block of time provided to organized opposition is to reduce the number of overall speakers who are part of the organized opposition. The requestor should advise the group that the Commission would expect the organized presentation to represent their testimony, if granted. Organized opposition will be recognized only upon written application at least 72 hours in advance of the hearing, through the Commission Secretary, the President or Chair. Such application should identify the community organization(s) and speakers. For items that have already been heard, testimony from organized opposition may be limited to three (3) minutes.
  - d. Public testimony from individuals not to exceed three (3) minutes each. For items that have already been heard, the President (or Chair) may limit such public testimony to a shorter time period.
  - e. Action by the Commission on the matter before it.
  - f. In public hearings on Draft Environmental Impact Reports, public testimony from individuals not to exceed three (3) minutes each will be provided. For items that have already been heard, the President (or Chair) may limit such public testimony to a shorter period.
  - g. The President (or Chair) may impose time limits on appearances by all persons, including members of the public, and may otherwise exercise his or her discretion on procedures for the conduct of public hearings.
  - h. Amendment(s) to motions should be read into the record before the vote is taken.
  
- II. Other:
 

Revisions submitted at hearing are discouraged and will only be considered at the Commission's discretion.

## **E. Policy or Major Project Informational Presentations**

- I. Hearing Procedures:
  - a. An introduction of the item or issue by the Director or Staff.
  - b. A presentation of the item or issue by Staff or the issuing agency not to exceed 20 minutes.
  - c. Public testimony from individuals not to exceed three (3) minutes each. The President (or Chair) may impose time limits on appearances by all persons, including members of the public, and may otherwise exercise his or her discretion on procedures for the conduct of public hearings.

- II. Other:  
Revisions submitted at hearing are discouraged and will only be considered at the Commission's discretion.

## F. CEQA Appeals of Negative Declarations

- I. Hearing Procedures:
  - a. A thorough description of the issue by the Director or Staff
  - b. A presentation by the Appellant(s) team (includes appellant or their designee, lawyers, architects, engineers, expeditors, and/or other advisors) not to exceed ten (10) minutes. For items that have already been heard, Appellants may be limited to three (3) minutes.
  - c. A presentation by the Project Sponsor(s) team (includes sponsor or their designee, lawyers, architects, engineers, expeditors, and/or other advisors not to exceed ten (10) minutes. For items that have already been heard, the Project Sponsor may be limited to three (3) minutes.
  - d. Public testimony from individuals not to exceed three (3) minutes each. For items that have already been heard, the President (or Chair) may limit such public testimony to a shorter period.
  - e. The President (or Chair) may impose time limits on appearances by all persons, including members of the public, and may otherwise exercise his or her discretion on procedures for the conduct of public hearings. Amendment(s) to motions should be read into the record before the vote is taken.

**NOTE:** The Commission strongly discourages members of the public, project sponsors, architects, lawyers, etc. to cross the railing that separates the Commission and Staff from the public seating area to engage in conversation with Staff or the members of the Commission while a meeting is in session.

**AMENDED:** August XX, 2021

**From:** [Ionin, Jonas \(CPC\)](#)  
**To:** [Sue Hestor](#); [CPC-Commissions Secretary](#); [Lynch, Laura \(CPC\)](#)  
**Subject:** Re: Plan Comm Rules - continued today?  
**Date:** Thursday, June 24, 2021 10:32:20 AM

---

Yes.

**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:** Sue Hestor <hestor@earthlink.net>  
**Date:** Thursday, June 24, 2021 at 10:27 AM  
**To:** CPC-Commissions Secretary <commissions.secretary@sfgov.org>, "Ionin, Jonas (CPC)" <jonas.ionin@sfgov.org>, "Lynch, Laura (CPC)" <laura.lynch@sfgov.org>  
**Subject:** Plan Comm Rules - continued today?

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

Will amendment of Planning Commission Rules be proposed for continuance at today's hearing?

On continuances - before hearing?

Sue Hestor

**From:** [CPC-Commissions Secretary](#)  
**To:** [Lynch, Laura \(CPC\)](#); [CPC-Commissions Secretary](#)  
**Subject:** RE: Comments re: CPC Rules and Regulation changes 2021-004810CRV  
**Date:** Wednesday, June 23, 2021 11:09:18 AM

---

It's been added. Jonas has forwarded it to me earlier.

**Commission Affairs**

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

Due to COVID-19, San Francisco Planning is operating remotely, and the City's Permit Center is open on a limited basis. 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:** Lynch, Laura (CPC) <[laura.lynch@sfgov.org](mailto:laura.lynch@sfgov.org)>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, June 23, 2021 9:09 AM  
**To:** CPC-Commissions Secretary <[commissions.secretary@sfgov.org](mailto:commissions.secretary@sfgov.org)>  
**Subject:** FW: Comments re: CPC Rules and Regulation changes 2021-004810CRV

Hi Josie,

I am not sure if this has already been included in the correspondence folder. If not, can you please add?

Thank you,

Laura

**Laura Lynch, Senior Planner**  
**Manager of Commission Affairs**

San Francisco Planning  
49 South Van Ness Avenue, Suite 1400, San Francisco, CA 94103  
Direct: 628-652-7554 | [www.sfplanning.org](http://www.sfplanning.org)  
[San Francisco Property Information Map](#)

Due to COVID-19, San Francisco Planning is operating remotely, and the City's Permit Center is open on a limited basis. 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](mailto:jonas.ionin@sfgov.org)>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, May 25, 2021 2:12 PM  
**To:** Lynch, Laura (CPC) <[laura.lynch@sfgov.org](mailto:laura.lynch@sfgov.org)>  
**Subject:** FW: Comments re: CPC Rules and Regulation changes 2021-004810CRV

**From:** [Lynch, Laura \(CPC\)](#)  
**To:** [CPC-Commissions Secretary](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Per your request  
**Date:** Wednesday, June 23, 2021 8:52:55 AM  
**Attachments:** [File #2021-004810 CRV, May 27, 2021 Planning Commission agenda item #7.pdf](#)

---

Hi Josie,

Please add this email with attachment to the correspondence folder. It was sent directly to the Commissioners.

Thank you,  
Laura

---

**From:** Tiffany Hickey <[tiffanyh@advancingjustice-alc.org](mailto:tiffanyh@advancingjustice-alc.org)>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, May 26, 2021 9:51 AM  
**To:** Koppel, Joel (CPC) <[joel.koppel@sfgov.org](mailto:joel.koppel@sfgov.org)>; Moore, Kathrin (CPC) <[kathrin.moore@sfgov.org](mailto:kathrin.moore@sfgov.org)>; Chan, Deland (CPC) <[deland.chan@sfgov.org](mailto:deland.chan@sfgov.org)>; Diamond, Susan (CPC) <[sue.diamond@sfgov.org](mailto:sue.diamond@sfgov.org)>; Fung, Frank (CPC) <[frank.fung@sfgov.org](mailto:frank.fung@sfgov.org)>; Imperial, Theresa (CPC) <[theresa.imperial@sfgov.org](mailto:theresa.imperial@sfgov.org)>; Tanner, Rachael (CPC) <[rachael.tanner@sfgov.org](mailto:rachael.tanner@sfgov.org)>; Hillis, Rich (CPC) <[rich.hillis@sfgov.org](mailto:rich.hillis@sfgov.org)>; Chion, Miriam (CPC) <[miriam.chion@sfgov.org](mailto:miriam.chion@sfgov.org)>; Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <[board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org](mailto:board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org)>; BOS-Legislative Aides <[bos-legislative\\_aides@sfgov.org](mailto:bos-legislative_aides@sfgov.org)>; Race & Equity in all Planning Coalition (REP) <[All\\_Planning\\_ForThe\\_People@googlegroups.com](mailto:All_Planning_ForThe_People@googlegroups.com)>  
**Subject:** File #2021-004810 CRV, May 27, 2021 Planning Commission agenda item #7

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

Dear Planning Commission President Koppel

Please find the Race and Equity in all Planning Coalition's letter regarding File #2021-004810 CRV, May 27, 2021 Planning Commission agenda item #7 attached.

Best regards,

**Tiffany L. Hickey**

*Staff Attorney, Housing Rights Program*

(Pronouns: she/her)

---

**Asian Americans Advancing Justice – Asian Law Caucus**

55 Columbus Avenue | San Francisco | California 94111

T: (415) 237-3630 (google voice)

F: (415) 896-1702

[tiffanyh@advancingjustice-alc.org](mailto:tiffanyh@advancingjustice-alc.org)

[www.advancingjustice-alc.org](http://www.advancingjustice-alc.org)

*Confidentiality Notice: This transmission may be: (1) subject to the Attorney-Client Privilege, (2) an Attorney Work Product, or (3) strictly Confidential. If you are not the intended recipient of this message, you may not disclose, print, copy or disseminate this information. If you have received this in error, please reply and notify the sender (only) and delete the message. Unauthorized interception of this e-mail is a violation of federal criminal law. Thank you.*



26 May 2021

Planning Commission President, Joel Koppel  
Planning Commissioners Kathrin Moore (Vice-President), Deland Chan, Sue Diamond, Frank Fung, Theresa Imperial, Rachael Tanner

Re: File #2021-004810 CRV  
May 27, 2021 Planning Commission agenda item #7

Dear Planning Commission and Planning Staff

Please accept these comments on behalf of the Race & Equity in all Planning Coalition in response to the proposed changes to Commission Rules and Regulations as referenced above, scheduled to be heard at the Planning Commission hearing this Thursday, May 27.

Section 2 of the referenced Rules & Regulations states "Further, the Commission reaffirms its commitment to racial & social equity and directs the Planning Department to ensure the diverse voices of San Francisco are given the opportunity to be heard and represented at all public meetings of the Commission."

Yet these recommended rule changes move the Planning Commission's public hearings firmly in the opposite direction of equity and were informed by neither the Race & Equity in all Planning coalition nor Planning's newly formed Equity Council.

The proposed changes to reduce the time from five to three minutes for Discretionary Review (DR) presentations and to allow for no rebuttal; to reduce public comment on DRs from three minutes to one minute; and to reduce the amount of time Commissioners have for reviewing DR and Conditional Use staff packets will significantly limit the voices of BIPOC and low income community members, not to "ensure the diverse voices of San Francisco are given the opportunity to be heard and represented". The Race and Equity in all Planning coalition strongly opposes these proposed changes.

Since the Planning Commission is interested in making changes to its Rules and Regulations to reaffirm its commitment to racial and social equity, we would like to offer the following recommendations for consideration.

#### **1. Enforce meeting procedures**

- a. When impacted communities request that public comment not be reduced, public comment will remain at least two minutes and will not be reduced to 1 minute.
- b. Presentations on project appeals from impacted communities should never be reduced from 5 minutes to 3 minutes.
- c. General public comment should not be limited to fifteen minutes total as this is an important time for the public to address the Commission on matters that the Commission is not considering on that particular agenda, but may be of great importance to communities.
- d. Meeting access information including the call-in number and access code, must be published with the agenda for the meeting, and cannot be changed between the publishing of the agenda and the time of the meeting.

## **2. Change how project notices are formatted**

- a. A plain language description of all projects should be prominently displayed at the project site, and will also be featured most prominently in mailed, written notices. *Example "This project proposes to demolish the existing building on this site and build 20 stories of housing with 400 units on top of 5 large retail spaces, all on top of an underground 200 space parking garage."*
- b. Include a clear and complete 3-D rendering of the proposed project if it involves significant alterations, or new construction of any kind.
- c. Make very clear, in simple language, how the public can provide comment, both in writing and in person, with dates, deadlines, Limited English Proficiency and disabled accessibility information, etc.

## **3. Language access**

- a. Identify and agree upon a pool of experienced, professional, and community trusted interpreters that can be present for interpretation. It is important that communities support the choice of interpreters to ensure that their public comment is authentic and fully represented. For less common languages not covered by the San Francisco Language Access Ordinance, a language line service should also be available.
- b. How to access interpretation support needs to be clearly communicated to residents and prominent on the notices, on the agenda, at the beginning of Planning Commission hearings and when agenda items commence that are located in bilingual communities.
- c. Noticing needs to be 30 days and the full text of notices needs to be provided in all threshold languages identified within the San Francisco Language Access Ordinance, to allow non-English speakers time to reach out to the Planning Department and Community Organizations to answer questions about a project and learn about how they can provide comment in both writing and in person.
- d. Notices need to provide culturally competent, contextual translation performed by agreed upon, community supported translators.

## **4. Disability access**

- a. All meetings should be accessible to everyone and include livestreams with ASL interpretation and/or captioning.
- b. Meeting agendas must include information about accessibility issues that have already been addressed and contact information for requesting additional accommodations.

Sincerely,

Race and Equity in All Planning Coalition

cc Rich Hillis, Director, Planning Department  
Miriam Chion, Equity Director, Planning Department  
Board of Supervisors

**From:** [Lynch, Laura \(CPC\)](#)  
**To:** [CPC-Commissions Secretary](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Planning's proposed Rule Changes  
**Date:** Wednesday, June 23, 2021 8:51:18 AM

---

Hi Josie,

Can you please add the below email to the correspondence folder? It was sent directly to the Commissioners already.

Thank you,  
Laura

---

**From:** anastasia Yovanopoulos <[shashacooks@yahoo.com](mailto:shashacooks@yahoo.com)>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, June 15, 2021 10:01 PM  
**To:** Lynch, Laura (CPC) <[laura.lynch@sfgov.org](mailto:laura.lynch@sfgov.org)>  
**Subject:** RE: Planning's proposed Rule Changes

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

Hello Laura Lynch,

FYI: Here is San Francisco Tenants Union's Discretionary Review Committee's response to Planning's proposed Rule Changes.

Anastasia

----- Forwarded Message -----

**From:** anastasia Yovanopoulos <[shashacooks@yahoo.com](mailto:shashacooks@yahoo.com)>  
**To:** Koppel Joel (CPC) <[joel.koppel@sfgov.org](mailto:joel.koppel@sfgov.org)>; [rachel.tanner@sfgov.org](mailto:rachel.tanner@sfgov.org) <[rachel.tanner@sfgov.org](mailto:rachel.tanner@sfgov.org)>; Diamond Susan (CPC) <[sue.diamond@sfgov.org](mailto:sue.diamond@sfgov.org)>; Fung Frank (CPC) <[frank.fung@sfgov.org](mailto:frank.fung@sfgov.org)>; KATHRIN MOORE <[mooreurban@aol.com](mailto:mooreurban@aol.com)>; Chan Deland (CPC) <[deland.chan@sfgov.org](mailto:deland.chan@sfgov.org)>; Theresa Imperial <[theresa.imperial@sfgov.org](mailto:theresa.imperial@sfgov.org)>  
**Cc:** Hillis Rich (CPC) <[rich.hillis@sfgov.org](mailto:rich.hillis@sfgov.org)>; Chion Miriam (CPC) <[miriam.chion@sfgov.org](mailto:miriam.chion@sfgov.org)>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, May 25, 2021, 09:32:04 AM PDT  
**Subject:** re: Planning's proposed Rule Changes

Re: File #2021-004810 CRV  
May 27, 2021 Planning Commission agenda item #7

Dear Planning Commissioners and Planning Staff,

I am writing on behalf of SF Tenants Union's Discretionary Review Committee in response to the proposed changes to Commission Rules and Regulations as referenced above, scheduled to be heard at the Planning Commission hearing this Thursday, May 27.

SF Tenants Union's DR Committee opposes all changes to Planning's Rules and urges the Planning Commission to reject them.

1). **Juxtaposing a statement that professes Planning's desire for equity and inclusiveness of diverse communities, with rule changes that would severely limit community engagement is antithetical.**

2) Cutting the time that Commissioners and community members would have of notification of a hearing, and to review relevant documents and to prepare for hearings by shortening the notification time for the publication of the Commission agenda and supporting documents to 72 hours is unacceptable.

3) **We object to shortening the time DR Requestors have for presentation to 3 minutes and eliminating rebuttal time.** We doubt that the Commission will gain an adequate understanding of the facts with an abbreviated presentation time, and no opportunity for rebuttal. Previously DR Requestors had 10 minutes, and then got limited to 5 minutes to present the facts of the case to the Commission including relevant photographs and documents in support.

4). **Shortening comment time of community members in support of the DR requestor to one minute does not foster equity and community engagement.** Previously comment of up to 3 minutes was the norm and then 2 minutes.

5) DR Requestors often rely on DR supporters to bring out additional/important facts that the DR requestor does not have time to make during the time allotted for their presentation.

7) The voices of community members would be severely curtailed by only having one minute to express their opinions about a particular project, and/or inform the Commissioners of any harm or specific impact or untended consequences that a project would have on individuals or on their communities .

Commissioners: In closing we recommend that the publication of the agenda and supporting documents remain unchanged, and that this Commission rejects all proposed changes to Planning Rules. None of the changes would foster inclusiveness, equity or understanding.

Yours truly,  
Anastasia Yovanopoulos  
SF Tenants Union DR Committee Coordinator

**From:** [SchuT](#)  
**To:** [Sider, Dan \(CPC\)](#)  
**Cc:** [Lynch, Laura \(CPC\)](#); [CPC-Commissions Secretary](#); [Ionin, Jonas \(CPC\)](#)  
**Subject:** Re: Number of DRs Withdrawn  
**Date:** Tuesday, June 22, 2021 5:07:27 PM

---

No worries, Dan.

I guess I was hoping to illuminate the fact that at the very least the Commissioners' time at Hearings is not taken up by an extraordinary (*and exceptional*) number of DRs.

I remember a conversation I had a few years ago with Jeff Joslin and he said the actual number of DRs heard by the Commission for that particular year....maybe it was 2017....was surprisingly small, given the angst that Request DRs can sometimes engender.

Anyways, you take good care and have a good evening.

Thanks very much.

Georgia

On Jun 22, 2021, at 3:57 PM, Sider, Dan (CPC) <[dan.sider@sfgov.org](mailto:dan.sider@sfgov.org)> wrote:

Hi Georgia

I did see your email; apologies for not responding. You're right- many DRs are filed that never find their way to the Commission, typically on account of arrangements made between the two conflicting parties. That's a useful data point as well, even if the nature of each case's specific resolution is bit less quantifiable.

dan

**Daniel A. Sider, AICP**  
**Director of Executive Programs**  
San Francisco Planning Department

**PLEASE NOTE MY NEW ADDRESS AND PHONE NUMBER:**

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

Direct: 628-652-7539 | [www.sfplanning.org](http://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](mailto:schuttishtr@sbcglobal.net)>

**Sent:** Tuesday, June 22, 2021 10:24 AM

**To:** Sider, Dan (CPC) <[dan.sider@sfgov.org](mailto:dan.sider@sfgov.org)>

**Cc:** Lynch, Laura (CPC) <laura.lynch@sfgov.org>; CPC-Commissions Secretary <commissions.secretary@sfgov.org>; Ionin, Jonas (CPC) <jonas.ionin@sfgov.org>  
**Subject:** Number of DRs Withdrawn

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

Dear Dan,

Good morning.

I just saw on the Correspondence part of the website for Thursday that the map of DRs was resent to the Commissioners for the hearing on the Rules and Regs on Thursday.

I just wanted to be sure you got this email below that I sent last month.

*And also to ask you if my question about DRs withdrawn made sense?*

*Fundamentally, that many DRs may be filed, but many are withdrawn and never heard by the Commission?*

Thanks much and take care.

Georgia Schuttish

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** Thomas Schuttish <[schuttishtr@sbcglobal.net](mailto:schuttishtr@sbcglobal.net)>

**Subject:** Number of DRs Withdrawn

**Date:** May 31, 2021 at 2:03:51 PM PDT

**To:** Dan Sider <[dan.sider@sfgov.org](mailto:dan.sider@sfgov.org)>

Dear Dan,

Happy Monday.

Before my eyes totally crossed I went over the spread sheet you were kind enough to send and based on the all the notations I counted about 392 addresses that said "closed-withdrawn" or just the word "withdrawn". That does seem awful high, but that is what I think I counted.

I say "about" because I am sure I wasn't perfect. Plus I did not count the ones that just said "closed".

I then had some lunch and then counted it a second time and I got 396!

So I guess my point would be that a lot of the DRs are withdrawn for whatever reason....Requestor's got cold feet or perhaps they reached a compromise with their neighbor?

But there are a great many that the Commission never hears or rather have never heard.

Thanks so much again for sending the info.

I really appreciate it.

Sincerely,

Georgia



**From:** [Josephine Radbill](#)  
**To:** [Koppel, Joel \(CPC\)](#); [Moore, Kathrin \(CPC\)](#); [Tanner, Rachael \(CPC\)](#); [Chan, Deland \(CPC\)](#); [CPC-Commissions Secretary](#); [Imperial, Theresa \(CPC\)](#); [Diamond, Susan \(CPC\)](#); [Lynch, Laura \(CPC\)](#); [Fung, Frank \(CPC\)](#)  
**Subject:** Letter re: proposed Rules and Regulation Changes  
**Date:** Tuesday, June 22, 2021 10:38:25 AM  
**Attachments:** [Rule changes SF Planning Commission updated 06222021.docx](#)

---

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

Hello President Koppel, Vice President Moore and Planning Commissioners,

I have attached a letter regarding the latest proposed changes to the Rules and Regulations, scheduled for the hearing this Thursday, June 24. I have cc'd Laura Lynch and the Commission Secretary on this email.

Thank You,

--

Josephine Radbill  
UNITE HERE Local 2  
415.815.2771  
*she/her/hers*

Joel Koppel, President  
San Francisco Planning Commission  
49 South Van Ness, Suite 1400  
San Francisco, CA 94103  
VIA EMAIL RE: 2021-004810CRV

Dear Planning Commission President Koppel, Vice President Moore, and Planning Commissioners,

This letter is in response to the proposed amendments to the SF Planning Commission Rules and Regulations on the June 24, 2021 agenda of the Planning Commission. We commend the Planning Commission for including a commitment to racial and social equity, “to ensure the diverse voices of San Francisco are given the opportunity to be heard and represented with reasonable accommodations at all public meetings of the Commission.”

**We ask that advanced staff reports be made available a minimum of two weeks before the hearing.** We find the language “staff reports for specific cases may be due earlier” to add ambiguity to the rules, rather than, as the Planning Department states in their Basis for Recommendation, “provid[ing] clarity to the public on procedures.” Which projects would qualify as “specific cases?” If a “due earlier” deadline results in an advanced staff report published less than two weeks out, i.e., a ten-day staff report, we ask that this rule change *not* be adopted.

We are also concerned with the proposed changes to the hearing procedures for projects that have already been heard. While we appreciate the goal of avoiding repetitive presentations at successive hearings, we find that it is somewhat restrictive to limit to three minutes the amount of time for presentations of the project sponsor and organized opposition. **In addition, we request that the President (or Chair) of the commission *not* be permitted to limited public comment to a period shorter than three minutes.** This proposed change is ambiguous and discretionary; it does not contribute to a more equitable planning process, especially considering the range of complexity of many projects that appear before more than one hearing. Please restore the three-minute time limit for public testimony.

We recognize that the Department staff must contend with an ever-growing workload and demands on their time and attention, and that the work of preparing and producing reports is time-consuming and often thankless, and so we encourage and support efforts to address this workload in a way that is suitable for all. We are concerned that these proposed changes, however, would have the unintended effect of impeding public access and participation, and we ask that they not be adopted.

Thank you for your consideration and I am available to answer any questions.

Sincerely,

Josephine Radbill  
Research Analyst  
UniteHere Local 2

**From:** [Lynch, Laura \(CPC\)](#)  
**To:** [Thomas Schuttish](#)  
**Cc:** [CPC-Commissions Secretary](#)  
**Subject:** RE: CPC Rules and Regs June 24, 2021 #2021-004810CRV  
**Date:** Monday, June 21, 2021 12:20:17 PM

---

Hi Georgia,

Thank you for your email and yes, you are correct. As stated on the weekly agenda, if the public wishes to have their email included in the correspondence folder, they must include [commissions.secretary@sfgov.org](mailto:commissions.secretary@sfgov.org) in the email. Additionally, if emails/comment letters are addressed to the Commission but only sent to the planner, our practice is to have the planners forward these to [commissions.secretary@sfgov.org](mailto:commissions.secretary@sfgov.org) for inclusion in the correspondence folder and distribution to the Commission. However, we encourage the public to email [commissions.secretary@sfgov.org](mailto:commissions.secretary@sfgov.org) directly, to avoid any delay in correspondence posting (Planner being absent).

Thank you again and have a good day,  
Laura

Laura Lynch, Senior Planner  
Manager of Commission Affairs  
San Francisco Planning  
49 South Van Ness Avenue, Suite 1400, San Francisco, CA 94103  
Direct: 628-652-7554 | [www.sfplanning.org](http://www.sfplanning.org)  
San Francisco Property Information Map

Due to COVID-19, San Francisco Planning is operating remotely, and the City's Permit Center is open on a limited basis. 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: Thomas Schuttish <[schuttishtr@sbcglobal.net](mailto:schuttishtr@sbcglobal.net)>  
Sent: Friday, June 18, 2021 3:06 PM  
To: Lynch, Laura (CPC) <[laura.lynch@sfgov.org](mailto:laura.lynch@sfgov.org)>  
Cc: CPC-Commissions Secretary <[commissions.secretary@sfgov.org](mailto:commissions.secretary@sfgov.org)>  
Subject: CPC Rules and Regs June 24, 2021 #2021-004810CRV

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

Dear Laura,

Hope you are having a good holiday...Happy Juneteenth!

I don't think it is completely clear to the public how they get their written documents in front of the Commissioners. The packets with the case file are determined by the Planner?

The packets show up in the online Supporting Documents with the case number or on the Agenda itself by clicking on the case number in both places?

Then there is also the Correspondence - Pre-Hearing.

If someone writes to the Commissions Secretary email address, and/or Mr. Ionin and/or the Planner, it will not get in the specific packet for the project because that is put together by the Planner?

If the public wants to feel comfortable or reasonably sure that what they want to say about a project (or an issue) is likely to be read by the members of the Planning Commission, the decision makers, then the public needs to address

their correspondence to each Commissioner's email directly, as well as the Planner's email, the Commissions Secretary email address and Mr. Ionin's email? I don't think this is completely clear to the public.  
Thanks much and take good care.  
Georgia

**From:** [Josephine Radbill](#)  
**To:** [Lynch, Laura \(CPC\)](#); [Ionin, Jonas \(CPC\)](#); [Chan, Deland \(CPC\)](#); [Diamond, Susan \(CPC\)](#); [Fung, Frank \(CPC\)](#); [Imperial, Theresa \(CPC\)](#); [Tanner, Rachael \(CPC\)](#); [Koppel, Joel \(CPC\)](#); [Moore, Kathrin \(CPC\)](#); [CPC-Commissions Secretary](#)  
**Subject:** Comments re: updated CPC Rules and Regulation changes 2021-004810CRV  
**Date:** Tuesday, June 8, 2021 3:58:36 PM  
**Attachments:** [CPC Rules and Regulation changes 2021-004810CRV.pdf](#)

---

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

Hello,

Please see our attached comments regarding the updated CPC Rules and Regulations changes, record number 2021-004810CRV, scheduled for the June 10, 2021 Planning Commission meeting.

Thank You,

--

Josephine Radbill  
UNITE HERE Local 2  
415.815.2771  
*she/her/hers*

Laura Lynch  
SF Planning Department  
49 South Van Ness Avenue  
Suite 1400  
San Francisco, CA 94103  
VIA EMAIL RE: 2021-004810CRV

This letter is in response to the proposed amendments to the SF Planning Commission Rules and Regulations on the June 10, 2021 agenda of the Planning Commission. We commend the Planning Commission for including a commitment to racial and social equity, “to ensure the diverse voices of San Francisco are given the opportunity to be heard and represented with reasonable accommodations at all public meetings of the Commission.”

It is in the spirit of our shared commitment to equity that we find it necessary to voice our concerns about the proposed changes to the rules and regulations. Reducing the amount of time the public has to review submittals, such as staff reports, would function to reduce or even exclude participation in the planning process. Under the proposed change, staff reports would be available at publication of the hearing agenda: a minimum of 72-hours before the meeting, or possibly as late as 1 p.m. Monday the week of the hearing. Even for those members of the public who use computers and are able to read PDF attachments, this time interval would already be very short, especially as many of these reports include detailed plans and multiple reports and can reach thousands of pages in total. Access would be even more curtailed for those members of the public who need to visit the Planning Department’s office at 49 South Van Ness to review documents in person.

The COVID-19 pandemic brought the challenges of the digital divide into stark contrast: according to the SF Chronicle, 100,000 San Franciscans lack broadband internet connections<sup>1</sup>. These residents are majority people of color from working-class backgrounds; they would need to be able to access this information in person in order to meaningfully participate in the planning process. Moving the submittal period closer to the hearing date exacerbates disparities the city seeks to resolve.

We ask that the ability to request a two-week staff report be restored. We find the language “staff reports for specific cases may be due earlier” to add ambiguity to the rules, rather than, as the Planning Department states in their Basis for Recommendation, “provid[ing] clarity to the public on procedures.” Which projects would qualify as “specific cases?” When is a deadline of “due earlier?” This amendment would add uncertainty and reduce the final review time at the penultimate step of what is often a multi-year planning process.

Furthermore, under the proposed changes, if the public seeks to send comments to the Commissioners, they would have to do so without being able to review the submittals, potentially including the final plans for a project. This amendment to the rules and regulations impedes informed public input.

---

<sup>1</sup> SF Chronicle: *Can San Francisco realize the dream of public internet?* August 9, 2020

We are also concerned with the proposed changes to the hearing procedures for projects that have already been heard. While we appreciate the goal of avoiding repetitive presentations at successive hearings, we find that it is somewhat restrictive to limit to three minutes the amount of time for presentations of the project sponsor and organized opposition. In addition, we request that public testimony be restored to three minutes and that the President (or Chair) of the commission not be permitted to limited public comment to a shorter period. This proposed change is ambiguous and discretionary; it does not contribute to a more equitable planning process, especially considering the range of complexity of many projects that appear before more than one hearing. Please restore the three-minute time limit for public testimony.

We recognize that the Department staff must contend with an ever-growing workload and demands on their time and attention, and that the work of preparing and producing reports is time-consuming and often thankless, and so we encourage and support efforts to address this workload in a way that is suitable for all. We are concerned that these proposed changes, however, would have the unintended effect of impeding public access and participation, and we ask that they not be adopted.

Thank you for your consideration and I am available to answer any questions.

Sincerely,

Josephine Radbill  
Research Analyst  
UniteHere Local 2

**From:** [Sue Hestor](#)  
**To:** [Lynch, Laura \(CPC\)](#); [CPC-Commissions Secretary](#); [Koppel, Joel \(CPC\)](#); [Kathrin Moore](#); [Hillis, Rich \(CPC\)](#)  
**Cc:** [Fung, Frank \(CPC\)](#); [Diamond, Susan \(CPC\)](#); [Chan, Deland \(CPC\)](#); [Theresa Imperial](#); [Tanner, Rachael \(CPC\)](#); [STACY, KATE \(CAT\)](#)  
**Subject:** 3rd draft of amendments to CPC Rules and Regulations proposed  
**Date:** Thursday, June 03, 2021 3:12:49 PM  
**Attachments:** [2021-004810CRV - CPC Rules and Regulations Executive Summary and Draft Ammendments.pdf](#)

---

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

2 prior drafts of Department staff proposed amendments to Plan Comm Rules & Regulations have been provided to Commission and the public. Amendment of Rules is scheduled for Plan Comm hearing at 1pm on 6/10/21. Next Thursday.

This **3rd** draft of amendments was provided to public and Commission when it is literally IMPOSSIBLE for members of the public to submit written comments in manner that Planning Commissioners will have opportunity to read and consider the comments. Before voting on proposed changes.

**WHEN** will Commissioners review **AND**  
**CONSIDER** written comments on Rules revisions  
from members of public that come in after  
12:52pm 6/3 - when Ms. Lynch emailed 3rd  
revision?

Among important amendments are **when** reports on agenda items are available, **HOW** they are available, **time limits** for speakers.

The public - as well as Commissioners - has been struggling to participate in Planning Commission meetings for well over a year. Also without access to Department office to see/copy reports AND plans.

I appreciate staff "overview of edits" provided in this email. But overview does not substitute for careful reading of revisions proposed. Staff recommendation is simple - *Adopt Amendments*.

Since 3rd revision was not available 10 days in advance (Article V - Amendments), the Commission can take public comment on June 10, then Commission/Department discussion. Then continue item to VOTE on Rules amendment until June 24 when there will be a 6 member Commission.

More than simply giving "notice" is expected by **current** Rules. Actual language of proposed amendments is required.

Deferring the vote on proposed amendments will give Commission and the public to



follow current Rules.

Sue Hestor

----- Forwarded Message -----

**Subject:**CPC Rules and Regulations Executive Summary and Draft Amendments

**Date:**Thu, 3 Jun 2021 19:52:42 +0000

**From:**Lynch, Laura (CPC) <[laura.lynch@sfgov.org](mailto:laura.lynch@sfgov.org)>

**To:**Sue Hestor <[hestor@earthlink.net](mailto:hestor@earthlink.net)>

**CC:**Son, Chanbory (CPC) <[chanbory.son@sfgov.org](mailto:chanbory.son@sfgov.org)>

**From:** [Sue Hestor](#)  
**To:** [CPC-Commissions Secretary](#); [Koppel, Joel \(CPC\)](#); [Kathrin Moore](#); [Theresa Imperial](#); [Deland Chan](#); [Fung, Frank \(CPC\)](#); [Diamond, Susan \(CPC\)](#); [Tanner, Rachael \(CPC\)](#); [Lynch, Laura \(CPC\)](#)  
**Cc:** [Hillis, Rich \(CPC\)](#); [STACY, KATE \(CAT\)](#); [Teague, Corey \(CPC\)](#); [Sanchez, Scott \(CPC\)](#)  
**Subject:** Insufficient notice of amendment of Plan Comm Rules & Regulations HEARING 5/27 MUST BE CONTINUED  
**Date:** Wednesday, May 26, 2021 4:52:33 PM  
**Importance:** High

---

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

Planning Commission Rules & Regulations are calendared for amendment at 5/27/21 1pm Planning Commission hearing. According to ARTICLE V - AMENDMENTS to Commission Rules must be calendared for hearing at least ten days.

The amendment has been calendared without the REQUIRED language available to general public the required 10 days in advance.

Commission meeting is Thursday, May 27 at 1pm. 10 days prior is Monday, May 17 at 1pm. That requires that the **text of proposed amendments (2021-004810-CRV)** be available to the public at the latest by **MONDAY, MAY 17 at 1pm.**

The Planning Department provides information to the general public by posting information (at least) on the PIM or on Planning Department website. Although a few individuals in public may have received A DRAFT of proposed amendments as early as Monday, May 17, the (further amended) DRAFT proposed for Commission adoption was not available until either **Thursday, May 20**, when it was posted on PIM, or on **Friday, May 21** when agenda for May 27 was issued by Planning Department. The May 20 and 21 had MORE CHANGES and many differences from the amendments proposed and available on Monday, May 17.

**The Planning Commission CANNOT consider amendments to Planning Commission Rules at its May 27 1pm meeting without being in breach of its *CURRENT* Rules.**

Ever shifting amendments - known only to Department staff - presents the PUBLIC with an impossible situation, They must submit written comments IN ADVANCE. Serious time limits are imposed at Commission meetings. Department offices are CLOSED. Staff is not readily available to speak to. Meetings have been remote for OVER A YEAR. There is realistically no way for general public to speak to Commissioners.

The draft amendments published 5/21 could be heard IF THEY ARE NOT FURTHER AMENDED at any June Commission meeting.

**The Commission SHOULD CONTINUE THE HEARING ON**

**PROPOSED AMENDMENTS - and identify planner - at 5/27  
Commission meeting.**

FIRST Notice of Hearing was given on Friday May 14 at 2:05 when Plan Comm 5/20 calendar was emailed. It referred to - but did not include link to 2021-004810CRV - Commission Rules and Regulations.

An immediate search of Planning Department website, AND PIM, repeated over the weekend, located no text of proposed amendment of Rules and Regulations.

**5/15 10am** requested Advance calendar w/hearing 5/27 on amends to Rules & w/link to amendment to Plan Code

**5/16 4:47** record request - full text of 2021-004810 - amendments. Opened Monday 5/17 9:51am

**5/16 6:36pm** Hestor email to Plan Comm officers, Plan Comm secretary and various persons at Plan Dept/Comm - Comm agenda states strong encouragement for the public to submit their comments in writing in advance to commission secretary. Cant submit comments without advance information of substance of proposed amendment. Public has no information of what amendments proposed for 5/27. Who is author or amendment? Please provide full text of amendments. Please provide rationale for adopting amendment now - when only remote meetings make it difficult to public to participate in Commission meetings.

**I filed formal Request for language of amendment on Monday, May 17 at 9:51am**

5/17 9:58 - received proposed text from another member of public who had just received from Plan Comm secretary. (Not sent to Hestor despite 5/16 6:36pm email. Saw for first time amendment to staff reports/agenda from Thursday 7 days in advance of Comm meeting to Friday 6 days in advance, at time of publication of Commission agenda. And change in time limits for speakers and other changes that affect public input to Commissioners.

**5:17 11:37am** - requested information on time of publication of Commission agenda for the past 2 years back for November 2019. Before change to only virtual Commission meetings. When Department offices were open to public at 1650 Mission and staff packets could be reviewed and copied Thursdays and Fridays of preceding week Read at 11:40.

**5/17 11:55am** - after receipt of advance calendar, email why is 5/27 amendment of Planning Comm Rules & Regs missing from advance calendar, with no planner listed.

**5/17 12:04pm** - response by Laura Lynch to Hestor. She is assigned planner for

amendment of Rules. **Attaching 5/15 DRAFT of proposed amendments - latest draft.** Should be available on PIM. Making change in language based on Racial & Social Equity Plan. Also -

**staff identified areas of the Rules and Regulations that do not reflect current practices** and such amendments are being proposed.

In other words -

**THIS 5/15 draft is a work in progress. Other changes may be proposed by the Department.**

**Where the Department was not currently following Commission RULES (i.e. provision of staff packet 7 days in advance, time limits on for public and DR requestors to speak), amendments would be made to the Rules. INSTEAD OF CHANGING PRACTICE, i.e. making staff packets easily available on Department website by THURSDAY + following time limits for speakers as set out in current Rules.**

**THIS 5/15 DRAFT WAS THE VERSION OF PROPOSED CHANGES TO PLANNING COMMISSION RULES & REGULATIONS AVAILABLE TO THE PUBLIC 10 DAYS IN ADVANCE OF 5/27 1pm** Planning Commission hearing.

Notice of proposed amendment in agenda for 5/20 is all that is required (Lynch).

5/17 2:37 Hestor to Lynch - inquiring is this official draft on amendments to Plan Comm Rules & Regs? No others will be considered?

**5/17 2:43 LYNCH** - there may be further edits. **Final version** will be linked to next week's (5/27) agenda.

5/18 4:36 TO Lynch et al - provided emailed dates and times I had for various hearings in 2019, 2020, 2021 - predominantly Friday 2-5pm

**Thursday 5/20 4:27pm** - Lynch sent link to most recent version of proposed amendments. **I assert believe that Planning Department website was updated on the PIM to provide 2021-004810CRV - proposed amendments to Planning Commission Rules & Regulations. They are proposed for adoption Thursday 5/27 at 4:23pm.**

**5/21 3:30 - CPC Calendar for May 27, 2021 1pm** Planning Commission Public Hearing was issued by email from Planning Department. **Item 7** on agenda is 2021-004810CRV Commission Rules and Regulations, consideration of adopting amendments. It provided a link to a draft that had no identifying date and time. Changes had been made in DRAFT Rules - but NOT identified - to previous versions that had been sent to persons on May 17.

**From:** [Sue Hestor](#)  
**To:** [CPC-Commissions Secretary](#)  
**Subject:** Request staff report for 5/27/21 Commission Rules and Regulations - 2021-004810CRV  
**Date:** Friday, May 21, 2021 8:48:31 AM

---

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

Since Laura Lynch out until Monday, 5/24/21, making same request to Commission Secretary.

Sue Hestor

----- Forwarded Message -----

**Subject:** Request staff report for 5/27/21 Commission Rules and Regulations - 2021-004810CRV

**Date:** Fri, 21 May 2021 08:36:20 -0700

**From:** Sue Hestor <[hestor@earthlink.net](mailto:hestor@earthlink.net)>

**To:** Lynch, Laura (CPC) <[laura.lynch@sfgov.org](mailto:laura.lynch@sfgov.org)>

**CC:** CPC-RecordRequest <[CPC-RecordRequest@sfgov.org](mailto:CPC-RecordRequest@sfgov.org)>

Please provide immediately staff report for 5/27/21 amendments to Plan Comm Rules & Regulations

Thank you.

Sue Hestor

[hestor@earthlink.net](mailto:hestor@earthlink.net)

On 5/20/2021 4:27 PM, Lynch, Laura (CPC) wrote:

**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:** Josephine Radbill <[jradbill@unitehere2.org](mailto:jradbill@unitehere2.org)>

**Date:** Friday, May 21, 2021 at 3:23 PM

**To:** "Ionin, Jonas (CPC)" <[jonas.ionin@sfgov.org](mailto:jonas.ionin@sfgov.org)>, "Lynch, Laura (CPC)" <[laura.lynch@sfgov.org](mailto:laura.lynch@sfgov.org)>, "Chan, Deland (CPC)" <[deland.chan@sfgov.org](mailto:deland.chan@sfgov.org)>, "Diamond, Susan (CPC)" <[sue.diamond@sfgov.org](mailto:sue.diamond@sfgov.org)>, "Fung, Frank (CPC)" <[frank.fung@sfgov.org](mailto:frank.fung@sfgov.org)>, Theresa Imperial <[theresa.imperial@sfgov.org](mailto:theresa.imperial@sfgov.org)>, "Tanner, Rachael (CPC)" <[rachael.tanner@sfgov.org](mailto:rachael.tanner@sfgov.org)>, "joel.koppel@sfgov.org" <[joel.koppel@sfgov.org](mailto:joel.koppel@sfgov.org)>, "Moore, Kathrin (CPC)" <[kathrin.moore@sfgov.org](mailto:kathrin.moore@sfgov.org)>

**Subject:** Comments re: CPC Rules and Regulation changes 2021-004810CRV

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

Hello,

Please see attached comments regarding 2021-004810CRV: CPC Rules and Regulations.

Thank You,

--

Josephine Radbill  
UNITE HERE Local 2  
415.815.2771  
*she/her/hers*

May 21, 2021

Jonas Ionan, Commission Affairs Director  
Laura Lynch, Commission Affairs Manager  
San Francisco Planning Department  
49 South Van Ness Avenue, Suite 1400  
San Francisco, CA 94103  
RE: 2021-004810CRV  
VIA EMAIL

Dear Mr. Ionan and Ms. Lynch,

This letter is in response to the proposed amendments to the San Francisco Planning Commission Rules and Regulations on the May 27, 2021 agenda of the Planning Commission. We commend the Planning Commission for including a commitment to racial and social equity, “to ensure the diverse voices of San Francisco are given the opportunity to be heard and represented at all public meetings of the Commission.”

It is in the spirit of our shared commitment to equity that we must voice our concerns about the proposed changes to the Rules and Regulations. Reducing the amount of time the public has to review submittals, such as staff reports, would serve to reduce or even exclude participation in the planning process. Under the proposed change, staff reports would be available at publication of the hearing agenda: a minimum of 72 hours before the meeting, or possibly as late as Monday at 1 p.m. the week of the hearing. Even for those members of the public who use computers and are able to read PDF attachments, this time interval would already be very short, especially as many of these reports include detailed plans and multiple reports and can reach thousands of pages in total. Access would be even more curtailed for those members of the public who need to visit the Planning Department’s office at 49 South Van Ness to review documents in person.

The COVID-19 pandemic brought the challenges of the digital divide into stark contrast: according to the SF Chronicle, 100,000 San Franciscans lack broadband internet connection<sup>1</sup>. These residents are majority people of color from working-class backgrounds; they would need to be able to access this information in person in order to meaningfully participate in the planning process. Moving the submittal period closer to the hearing date exacerbates disparities the city seeks to resolve.

We also note that the previous language around staff reports allowed for a report to be issued two weeks before a hearing, which is often essential for complex projects that take considerable time for the public to review. The proposed removal of this two-week milestone, in favor of the non-specific language of “earlier,” is not sufficient for complex cases. This amendment would reduce the final review time at the penultimate step of what is often a multi-year planning process.

Furthermore, under the proposed changes, if the public seeks to send comments to the Commissioners, they would have to do so without being able to review the submittals, potentially including the final plans for a project. This amendment to the rules and regulations impedes informed public input.

We are also concerned with the proposed changes to the procedures for projects that have already been heard. While we appreciate the goal of avoiding repetitive presentations at successive hearings, we find that it is somewhat restrictive to limit to three minutes the amount of time for presentations of the project sponsor or organized opposition. Cutting public comment to one minute for such projects also seems extreme, especially considering the complexity of many projects that can require more than one hearing. In the interest of “ensur[ing] the diverse voices of San Francisco are given the opportunity to be heard and represented,” we ask that you restore the option of the three minute time limit for public testimony.

---

<sup>1</sup> SF Chronicle: *Can San Francisco realize the dream of public internet?* August 9, 2020



Finally, we had a clarifying question regarding Section D, "Cases;" can you please clarify which types of authorizations are included in the section marked, "etc"? We want to ensure we understand the implications for complicated projects that often seek several different approvals.

We recognize that Department staff must contend with an ever-growing workload and demands on their time and attention, and that the work of preparing and producing reports is time-consuming and often thankless, and so we encourage and support efforts to address this workload in a way that is sustainable for all. We are concerned that these proposed changes, however, would have the unintended effect of impeding public access and participation, and we ask that they not be adopted as currently proposed.

Thank you for your consideration and I am available to answer any questions.

Sincerely,

Josephine Radbill  
Research Analyst  
Unite Here, Local 2

CC: Planning Commissioners

**From:** [Lynch, Laura \(CPC\)](#)  
**To:** [CPC-Commissions Secretary](#)  
**Cc:** [Feliciano, Josephine \(CPC\)](#)  
**Subject:** Comment Letter CPC Rules and Regulations  
**Date:** Wednesday, May 19, 2021 12:31:51 PM  
**Attachments:** [2012-004810CRV.pdf](#)

---

Dear Commissioners,

Attached you will find a comment letter on the proposed updates to the CPC Rules and Regulations which will be on your May 27<sup>th</sup> 2021 agenda under “Commission Matters”.

Thank you,

Laura

**Laura Lynch, Senior Planner  
Manager of Commission Affairs**

San Francisco Planning  
49 South Van Ness Avenue, Suite 1400, San Francisco, CA 94103  
Direct: 628-652-7554 | [www.sfplanning.org](http://www.sfplanning.org)  
[San Francisco Property Information Map](#)

Due to COVID-19, San Francisco Planning is operating remotely, and the City’s Permit Center is open on a limited basis. 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](#).

To: Planning Commission  
From: Georgia Schuttish  
Re: 2021-004810CRV Commission Rules and Regulations, Hearing May 27, 2021  
Date: May 19, 2021

I am writing to comment on the Draft Version of the Rules and Regulations which Mr. Lonin was kind enough to send to me.

I think the cut to the time allowed for testifying in a Discretionary Review is too much.

I think that most people who file a Request for DR have very real concerns about a project and the affect it will have on their home....loss of light and air and privacy. Sometimes they have concerns about their neighborhood or the type of project. For example, I myself have filed two DRs with some of those concerns.

One in 2006 because of the impact it would have on the rear yard mid-block open space. It had a huge impact boxing in the neighbors and which then allowed another spec project in 2014 expanding into the rear yard. (This was prior to Section 317 and the 2006 project was most likely a Demolition even under the current Demo Calcs).

The second project was in 2018 and also a spec project right across the street from me. This project proposed to add a second unit, basically subterranean, 11 feet deep in a full lot excavation. One of my concerns was that this second unit would be unlivable....and that was right as it was subsequently found that two of the three bedrooms *would not meet* the Building Code for proper and safe egress.

I include these examples because they illustrate that DRs are not frivolous but involve real issues that should be presented to the Commission without being under even more pressure from a clock ticking away. **Here are my suggestions:**

**This Draft Version cuts the available time for both parties from seven minutes (5 minute presentation and 2 minute rebuttal) to three minutes total.**

**If you approve this reduction in time, I urge the Commission to reduce the cost of filing a DR to no more than \$250.00. I believe it is currently something like \$653.00 to file.**

**I also urge the Commission to put the DRs at the beginning of the Agenda so the public and their supporters (who only get a minute, which is really fast) at least do not have to sit through a long Agenda only to have scant time to testify on a matter that is so important to them.**

*Fundamentally though I hope the Commission realizes that people get nervous when they have to speak and this new time constraint for the DRs will only add to that.*

**From:** [SchuT](#)  
**To:** [CPC-Commissions Secretary](#); [Koppel, Joel \(CPC\)](#); [Moore, Kathrin \(CPC\)](#); [Diamond, Susan \(CPC\)](#); [Fung, Frank \(CPC\)](#); [Imperial, Theresa \(CPC\)](#); [Tanner, Rachael \(CPC\)](#); [Ionin, Jonas \(CPC\)](#); [Lynch, Laura \(CPC\)](#); [Sider, Dan \(CPC\)](#)  
**Subject:** Rules and Regs July 15th Hearing  
**Date:** Wednesday, July 14, 2021 6:09:02 PM

---

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

Good evening, Commissioners and Staff.

Apologies for the late comments on this, but I just re-read the Draft changes and realized I mis-read them, particularly for Discretionary Review.

1. Non-Community Group DR Requestors, aka individual neighbors, only get three (3) minutes total. If this amount of time is approved please the reduce the filing fee to \$250.00 and put these individual Requests for DR at the front of the Agenda.  
Or give these individual Requests for DR the same amount of time (five (5) minutes and two (2) minute rebuttal) as the Community Groups. (The ice-cream store debacle should not be used as an excuse to limit comments in Residential neighborhoods dealing with housing issues).
2. With regard to CUAs if the Project Sponsor *only* takes five (5) minutes to speak, then the Organized opposition is reduced to five minutes, *not* the ten (10) minutes the organized opposition could have per the text. At least that is how it reads. That doesn't seem fair. Organized opposition for CUAs should always have the ten (10) minutes.
3. There should be certainty for the public *in advance* of the hearing, allowing for three (3) minutes to comment (DR, CUA, General Public Comment, etc) and not blindside them with announcement of less time per the call of the chair at the start of hearing the item for the first time.
4. Although the pattern since the Remote hearings has been one (1) to two (2) minutes for any type of Public Comment, please allow three (3) minutes for the July 22nd hearing on the Large Residence Ordinance as this is a complicated and contentious issue....for everyone!

Thank you.  
Georgia Schuttish

**From:** [T Flandrich](#)  
**To:** [CPC-Commissions Secretary](#); [Koppel, Joel \(CPC\)](#); [Moore, Kathrin \(CPC\)](#); [Imperial, Theresa \(CPC\)](#); [Chan, Deland \(CPC\)](#); [Diamond, Susan \(CPC\)](#); [Fung, Frank \(CPC\)](#); [Tanner, Rachael \(CPC\)](#); [Lynch, Laura \(CPC\)](#); [Chion, Miriam \(CPC\)](#); [Hillis, Rich \(CPC\)](#)  
**Subject:** 2021-004810 CRV Commission Rules & Regulations July 15th, Item #6  
**Date:** Tuesday, July 13, 2021 10:18:06 AM

---

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

Dear Commissioners,

I ask you to please reject these changes and allow for continued meaningful public participation in planning commission hearings. Developers meet with Planners behind closed doors, and public comment period is the only time all San Franciscans can weigh in on plans that impact the public in numerous ways.

Thank you for agreeing that these suggested limits must be rejected.

Sincerely,  
Theresa Flandrich

**From:** [Karen Wood](#)  
**To:** [Koppel, Joel \(CPC\)](#); [Moore, Kathrin \(CPC\)](#); [Chan, Deland \(CPC\)](#); [Diamond, Susan \(CPC\)](#); [Fung, Frank \(CPC\)](#); [Imperial, Theresa \(CPC\)](#); [Tanner, Rachael \(CPC\)](#)  
**Cc:** [CPC-Commissions Secretary](#); [Ionin, Jonas \(CPC\)](#)  
**Subject:** Item 6: . 2021-004810CRV – COMMISSION RULES AND REGULATIONS  
**Date:** Wednesday, July 14, 2021 4:54:40 PM

---

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

Dear President Koppel, Vice President Moore, and Commissioners:

Among the goals of the Department’s Racial and Social Equity Vision is the achievement of “more inclusive community engagement.”

This is an important and timely goal. But it is difficult if not impossible to understand any way in which it is to be advanced by shrinking the speaking opportunities of Discretionary Review requestors at Commission hearings. To do so will undermine the credibility--and the utility to the community--of the entire Discretionary Review process and, sadly, of the Commission itself.

Sincerely,

Karen Wood  
Zoning and Planning Committee, Miraloma Park Improvement Club (for identification  
Purposes only)  
Miraloma Park  
District 7

**From:** [lgpetty@juno.com](mailto:lgpetty@juno.com)  
**To:** [CPC-Commissions Secretary](#); [Koppel, Joel \(CPC\)](#); [Moore, Kathrin \(CPC\)](#); [Imperial, Theresa \(CPC\)](#); [Chan, Deland \(CPC\)](#); [Diamond, Susan \(CPC\)](#); [Fung, Frank \(CPC\)](#); [Tanner, Rachael \(CPC\)](#); [Lynch, Laura \(CPC\)](#); [Chion, Miriam \(CPC\)](#); [Hillis, Rich \(CPC\)](#); [CPC-Commissions Secretary](#)  
**Subject:** RE: Commission Rules & Regulations 2021-004810 CRV, June 15, 2021 #6  
**Date:** Saturday, July 10, 2021 10:26:41 PM

---

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

RE: 2021-004810 CRV, June 15, 2021 Commission Rules & Regulations #6

Dear President Koppel, Vice President Moore and Planning Commissioners,

As a longtime affordable housing and tenant's rights advocate for seniors, I'm writing to urge you to reject all of these proposed changes. They are unnecessary at this time, and extremely restrictive of the public's ability to express opinions on the grave matters that come before the Commissioners. The changes also give undue and undemocratic power to the President or Acting Chair to, at hearings, arbitrarily, at will, without notice, change procedures and add further cuts to the public's right to be heard.

Planning Staff emphasizes in many ongoing communications that community inclusion is a major priority. In the Executive Summary for July 15, 2021, Staff has maintained that it has addressed community concerns over proposed changes and has aligned its changes with the Planning Department's Racial and Social Equity Action Plan.

Yet, in closely examining these changes, it appears that Staff have not heard, aligned, addressed or adopted the wishes of the San Francisco communities it has pledged to serve. These changes should not stand.

For example, regarding DR's CUA's, CEQA appeals, et al:

It is wrong and exclusionary, to reduce the amount of allowable testimony and public comment. It is also exclusionary to further allow allotted times and procedures to be restricted by discretionary, arbitrary powers given to the Chair. This may bring momentary convenience to planners and commissioners, but might result in a lifetime of inconvenience for residents affected by a project.

**Using “current practice” as justification for permanently reducing the public's opportunity to speak, is not only false logic, it is a denial of adequate public redress and outright rejection of equality and equity.**

In the same way, eliminating Rebuttal might again be a convenient time-saver for

Planning, but completely ruinous for those who are facing lifetime consequences of living with a plan or proposal.

**It is unfair and discriminatory to reduce EVERYONE's opportunity to speak, simply because Staff views SOME reviews or appeals as "frivolous."**

In addition, equity is not served by granting extra rights only to neighborhood groups recognized as legitimate by Planning Staff. What of the rights of other groups who don't fit Staff's definitions? And what of other members of the group who need Public Comment time to express different aspects of a plan?

Another example of inequality and lack of equity in these proposals, would be to arbitrarily limit General public comment to 15 minutes or move a portion to the end of Commission meetings. This would impose hours-long hardships on members of the public forced to wait to speak: the equivalent of telling many San Francisco residents to "get to the back of the bus."

Limiting General Public comment to 15 minutes in total is, in itself, unfair and discriminatory. This clearly messages that only the first people in the queue are deserving of being heard.

If many people queue up to speak on an issue, that illustrates its importance to the public and makes it all the more important for each and every person to be heard... with adequate time and in a respectful, timely manner.

Commissioners, I urge you...

DO NOT take away ANY minutes of testimony or public comment.

DO NOT codify arbitrary power to the President or Chair to reduce the public's rights to be heard or alter procedures at will.

Overall, these proposed changes add exclusionary restrictions and complications to the public's participation in the planning process. As we are seeing with many current voting proposals across the country... the more complexities, the more you diminish the public's voice in decisions and the more you stifle the truth.

Please reject all of these proposals.

Thank you for your consideration.

Lorraine Petty

member, SDA & SFTU

lgpetty@juno.com

---



**From:** [Sue Hestor](#)  
**To:** [CPC-Commissions Secretary](#); [Koppel, Joel \(CPC\)](#); [Kathrin Moore](#)  
**Cc:** [Fung, Frank \(CPC\)](#); [Diamond, Susan \(CPC\)](#); [Theresa Imperial](#); [Tanner, Rachael \(CPC\)](#); [Hillis, Rich \(CPC\)](#); [Lynch, Laura \(CPC\)](#)  
**Subject:** Planning Commission Rules 7/15 - REQUEST TESTIMONY but delay VOTE TO ADOPT  
**Date:** Wednesday, July 14, 2021 3:46:00 PM

---

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

At tomorrow's (7/15/21) Planning Commission meeting, the Commission will have its **first** opportunity to hear from the public on changes to its Rules developed by Planning staff. There has never been a meeting where the public and Commission can hear each other discuss this evolving proposal to make major amendments to your Rules..

**I request that the Commission hear, discuss, but then delay a formal vote on adoption of these major changes in Commission Rules.**

There have been three sets of proposed amendments, with both substantive and stylistic changes. There have been ZERO live meetings with staff or with Commission.

Amendments include **changes to time limits, when staff reports provided, contents of staff reports**, and major changes affecting **public participation** on projects. Emails have been submitted by various members of the public.

There is "**Recommendation**" - ADOPT AMENDMENTS

But there is *no proposed motion*. Just page after page showing language with changes of substance and stylistic amendments.

Proposed amendments include requirements for submittal **briefs for Discretionary Review** which are quite specific as to page layout - making it possible to understand any revised language.

In contrast, text of **THESE amendments to Commission Rules**, makes it extremely difficult to track any public or Commission discussion of amendments. Merely explaining the location of a revision, and the exact wording requested, could take more time than allowed to a public speaker.

How will any revision to the amendments be read back CLEARLY so that Commissioners and the public knows what revision is amended? (Speakers are not always audible for remote hearings.)

This is the **FIRST hearing** on proposed amendments. Please take public testimony. Then have a Commission discussion. Give direction to staff about which proposed

amendments are acceptable, which are not, and which need changes.

THEN direct that the revisions be presented in written form - exact language for specific changes - AND PRESENTED IN WRITING TO THE PUBLIC at least 2 weeks before the continued hearing where the Commission can consider and VOTE.

Among other matters please specify exactly when these provisions of Amendments (e.g. time limits, written submissions) will take effect.

The public and the COMMISSIONERS deserve the opportunity to have information before them when a major amendment to Commission Rules is voted on.

Respectfully submitted,

Sue Hestor

**From:** [Kathleen Courtney](#)  
**To:** [Koppel, Joel \(CPC\)](#); [Moore, Kathrin \(CPC\)](#); [Chan, Deland \(CPC\)](#); [Fung, Frank \(CPC\)](#); [Diamond, Susan \(CPC\)](#); [Imperial, Theresa \(CPC\)](#); [Tanner, Rachael \(CPC\)](#)  
**Cc:** [Director Rich Hillis](#); [Jamie Cherry](#); [John Borruso](#); [Chris Bigelow](#); [Tucker, Robyn](#); [CPC-Commissions Secretary](#)  
**Subject:** Proposed Changes to DR and CU Protocols - Minimize Citizen Participation  
**Date:** Thursday, July 15, 2021 12:51:24 PM  
**Importance:** High

---

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

President Koppel and Members of the Planning Commission –

The price of “efficiency” in the proposed changes to the Discretionary Review and Conditional Use protocols which will be reviewed today is the significant loss of the voice of concerned citizens and residents.

Citizens and residents who identify a concern, struggle to understand the steps necessary to bring it to the Planning Department and Planning Commission’s attention and then are left with minimized opportunities to participate in the process.

The price of “efficiency” is a loss of citizen participation...and that is too high a price.

This is an issue that deserves further study and input from those affected – the residents of the City. We urge you to request further study by the Planning Department with consideration given to the comments of all.

Kathleen Courtney  
Chair, Housing & Zoning Committee  
Russian Hill Community Association  
[kcourtney@rhcasf.com](mailto:kcourtney@rhcasf.com)  
(c) 510-928-8243

**From:** [factory 1 design](#)  
**To:** [Koppel, Joel \(CPC\)](#)  
**Cc:** [Moore, Kathrin \(CPC\)](#); [Chan, Deland \(CPC\)](#); [Diamond, Susan \(CPC\)](#); [Fung, Frank \(CPC\)](#); [Imperial, Theresa \(CPC\)](#); [Tanner, Rachael \(CPC\)](#); [Hillis, Rich \(CPC\)](#); [Chion, Miriam \(CPC\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#); [Lynch, Laura \(CPC\)](#); [Ionin, Jonas \(CPC\)](#); [Race & Equity in all Planning Coalition \(REP\)](#)  
**Subject:** File #2021-004810 CRV August 26, 2021 Planning Commission agenda  
**Date:** Wednesday, August 18, 2021 12:54:47 PM  
**Attachments:** [PlanningProceduresChangesNo2\\_18Aug2021.pdf](#)

---

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

Dear Planning Commission President Koppel-

Please find the attached follow up letter from Race and Equity in all Planning Coalition regarding File #2021-004810 CRV, for the August 26, 2021 Planning Commission agenda.

Best,

Larisa Pedroncelli  
member, Race and Equity in all Planning Coalition

18 August 2021

Planning Commission President, Joel Koppel  
Planning Commissioners Kathrin Moore (Vice-President), Deland Chan, Sue Diamond, Frank Fung, Theresa Imperial, Rachael Tanner  
Planning Staff, Laura Lynch

**Re: File #2021-004810 CRV  
August 26, 2021 Planning Commission agenda**

Dear Planning Commission and Planning Staff,

Please accept these comments on behalf of the Race & Equity in all Planning Coalition in response to the proposed changes to Commission Rules and Regulations as referenced above, scheduled to be heard at the Planning Commission hearing Thursday, August 26.

The REP Coalition previously wrote to you about our concerns with the proposed changes to Planning Commission Rules and Regulations, and we appreciate having had an opportunity to meet with Planning staff about our concerns. Together we explored how Rules and Regulations changes can meet the needs of the Planning Department while also meeting urgent equity issues that communities throughout San Francisco are experiencing.

Unfortunately, we find the latest version of the proposed Rules and Regulations changes still works against the Department's stated "commitment to racial and social equity." In fact, the proposed Rules and Regulations changes are poised to impose the opposite effect which is to limit debate and complete presentation of community analysis of development proposals that will have detrimental impacts. Planning Commissioners need to know, in full and complete detail, the analysis of impacts by vulnerable communities, otherwise the Commission is forced to make decisions with an imbalance of information, weighted heavily in favor of the project sponsor, which works directly against any aspirations of equity.

Article I, Section 2 of the proposed Rules & Regulations states "The Commission directs the Planning Department to *ensure the diverse voices of San Francisco are given the opportunity to be heard and represented* at all public meetings of the Commission."

We are concerned that these proposed Rules and Regulations work against this commitment to democratic and inclusive process. In addition, we are concerned that the Planning Department is moving farther away from community-led processes than even these Rules & Regulations indicate, as SB-35 and other permit streamlining measures are encouraged by Planning staff. In the [August 9, 2021 edition of the SF Chronicle, the article "How One SF Housing Project Is Using State Laws to Circumvent Neighborhood Protest"](#) reports Planning

Director Hillis as saying, "... developers will likely increasingly use state law to circumvent local codes."

The low income, BIPOC and marginalized communities the REP Coalition represents need to retain the ability to fully express our views at Planning Commission hearings on matters that directly affect our lives, without the restriction of arbitrary time limits.

Article I, Section 2 says that "The Commission directs the Planning Department to ensure the diverse voices of San Francisco are given the opportunity to be heard and represented **with reasonable accommodations** at all public meetings of the Commission."

The REP Coalition is concerned that the proposed changes transfer too much discretion to Planning to establish what is "reasonable," and also limit the ability for our communities to present our substantive issues, leaving only the minimum amount of time for our voices to meet a performative "heard and represented" qualification, without being truly represented and taken seriously. Accordingly, we propose amending Appendix A of San Francisco Planning Commission Rules & Regulations as follows:

- a. Do not shorten the time for any member of the public to speak in any type of case.
- b. Do not expand the powers of the chair to change ANY rule, time or procedure during the meeting.
- c. Discretionary Review. Rebuttal should remain and be 3 minutes.
- d. Discretionary Review. Testimony by members of the public should be allowed for three minutes instead of "up to three minutes" each.
- e. Mandatory Discretionary Review. For items that have already been heard, and that are still open for public comment, the same rule should apply for projects being heard for the first time, that "Testimony by members of the public" should be for three minutes, instead of "for up to three minutes" each.
- f. Cases (CU; Office Allocation; Downtown Project). Under no circumstances should public comment be less than 3 minutes.

If a case has been heard and public comment is still open when that project comes back for another hearing, the organized opposition should have another ten minutes to present its case rather than being cut to three minutes, especially since there is still a minimum of three speakers, and the organized opposition is asked to refrain from having other neighborhood members comment-

- g. Cases (CU; Office Allocation; Downtown Project). For items that have already been heard, and that are still open for public comment, the same rule should apply for projects being heard for the first time, that "Testimony by members of the public" should be for three minutes instead of "for up to three minutes" each.

- h. CEQA Appeals of Negative Declarations. If an item has already been heard, and the hearing is still open, at the subsequent hearing, Appellants should not be limited to three minutes. These hearings are highly technical, so this limitation does not allow the Appellants to completely and clearly state their case. If a hearing is still open and ongoing, it means that the voice of the Appellant still needs to be heard in its completely and clearly stated argument.

These changes come from underrepresented communities, and if implemented would represent positive steps forward in giving the diverse voices of San Francisco the opportunity to be heard and represented in land use and development decisions that impact our communities. We offer the following recommendations for your consideration:

### **1. Enforce meeting procedures**

- a. Public comment should be allowed to be fully expressed by ensuring it is not ever reduced or shortened for expediency by the arbitrary discretion of the Commission Chair, or acting Chair.
- b. Presentations on project appeals should not ever be reduced from 5 minutes to 3 minutes.
- c. General public comment should not be limited to fifteen minutes total, as this is an important time for the public to address the Commission on matters that the Commission is not considering on that particular agenda, but may be of great importance to communities.
- d. All general public comment should be heard at the beginning of the agenda, with no portion moved to the end of the meeting.
- e. Meeting access information including the call-in number and access code, must be published with the agenda for the meeting, and cannot be changed between the publishing of the agenda and the time of the meeting.

### **2. Change the format and description of item project notices**

- a. Language access: Make it very clear, in simple language, how the public can provide comments, both in writing and in person, with dates, deadlines, Limited English Proficiency and disabled accessibility information, etc.
- b. Identify and agree upon a pool of experienced, professional, and community trusted interpreters that can be present for interpretation. It is important that communities support the choice of interpreters to ensure that their public comment is authentic and fully represented. For less common languages not covered by the San Francisco Language Access Ordinance, a language line service should also be available.

- c. How to access interpretation support needs to be clearly communicated to residents and prominent on the notices, on the agenda, at the beginning of Planning Commission hearings and when agenda items commence that are located in bilingual communities.
- d. Noticing needs to be 30 days and the full text of notices needs to be provided in all threshold languages identified within the San Francisco Language Access Ordinance, to allow non-English speakers time to reach out to the Planning Department and Community Organizations to answer questions about a project and learn about how they can provide comment in both writing and in person.
- e. Notices need to provide culturally competent, contextual translation performed by agreed upon, community supported translators.
- f. Project notices currently are impossible to understand, even for people who work in development and on land use issues. A plain language description of all projects should be prominently displayed at the project site, and should also be featured most prominently in mailed, written notices. *Example: "This project proposes to demolish the existing building on this site and build 20 stories of housing with 400 units on top of 5 large retail spaces, all on top of an underground 200 space parking garage."* Include a clear and complete 3-D rendering of the proposed project if it involves significant alterations, or new construction of any kind.

### **3. Disability access**

- a. All meetings should be accessible to everyone and include livestreams with ASL interpretation and/or captioning.
- b. Meeting agendas must include information about accessibility issues that have already been addressed and contact information for requesting additional accommodations.

Sincerely,


Race and Equity in All Planning Coalition

cc Rich Hillis, Director, Planning Department  
Miriam Chion, Equity Director, Planning Department



# Attachment D

Discretionary Review Applications Filed 2015-2020



0 0.25 0.5 1 Mile



## PLAN SUBMITTAL GUIDELINES

### GENERAL PLANNING INFORMATION HANDOUT MARCH 2020

Plan submittal requirements for Planning Department review of Building Permits and Planning Applications.

For questions, you can call the Planning counter at 628.652.7300 or email [pic@sfgov.org](mailto:pic@sfgov.org) where planners are able to assist you.

**Español:** Si desea ayuda sobre cómo llenar esta solicitud en español, por favor llame al 628.652.7550. Tenga en cuenta que el Departamento de Planificación requerirá al menos un día hábil para responder.

中文：如果您希望獲得使用中文填寫這份申請表的幫助，請致電628.652.7550。請注意，規劃部門需要至少一個工作日來回應。

**Filipino:** Kung gusto mo ng tulong sa pagkumpleto ng application na ito sa Filipino, paki tawagan ang 628.652.7550. Paki tandaan na mangangailangan ang Planning Department ng hindi kukulangin sa isang araw na pantrabaho para makasagot.

### Introduction

In order for Planning Department staff to accurately review projects in a timely manner, plan sets submitted with Building Permits and Planning applications must be complete and thorough. This handout provides plan requirements including scale, schedules, and material specifications. A comprehensive understanding of this handout and implementation of these requirements on plans to be reviewed by the Planning Department ensures an efficient staff review of the proposal. There are many components to a plan set that are discussed in this handout including: site survey, floor plans, elevations, sections, landscaping plan, material specifications, and photographs.

### Site Permit and Planning Applications

To assist an applicant in obtaining Planning Department approval for a Building Permit application without the need to submit a full set of working drawings, the City has developed a Site Permit procedure whereby the Planning Department is the first agency to review an application. Under this procedure, an applicant submits a Site Permit application to the Department of Building Inspection (DBI) with preliminary drawings and other materials required for Planning Department review.

As defined in the Building Code, a Site Permit is “a permit issued upon the approval of a building permit application based on conceptual preliminary drawings and documentation. The Site Permit plans shall describe the exterior of the building in sufficient detail to mark heights, lengths, and widths. Court sizes, openings, and other significant projections or recesses shall be located, sized, and dimensioned under the Site Permit. The interior shall indicate code exit paths, and major fire separations that may be required as for area separation walls or occupancy separations greater than one hour.”

DBI refers the Site Permit to Planning for review. Once Planning approves the Site Permit application, it is referred to the next reviewing agency. After the Site Permit application is approved by all reviewing agencies, and the permit is issued, the complete set of working drawings must be submitted to DBI for review. These working drawings must be consistent with the plans previously approved by Planning or DBI will return the plans to Planning for review to determine if they are still approvable. This may delay building permit issuance and potentially require a second neighborhood notification and revision recheck fee.

## **General Information**

Every set of plans should contain a title bar on each sheet that includes the person who prepared the plans, the project address, the date the plans were prepared, the drawing scale, the sheet number, and a professional certification stamp, if appropriate.

For revisions, the revised scopes of work should be clouded, with a numbered delta symbol indicating the revision number. The numbered delta symbol should be listed in the title block with a date indicating when the revision was made.

## **Title Sheet**

Provide a narrative of the existing use and site conditions, as well as the proposed project - including all scopes of work, the maximum depth of excavation, and total soil disturbance (in cubic yards).

The title sheet should also contain a project summary table, indicating the project's block and lot numbers, zoning district, height and bulk district, and proposed building height.

The project summary table should include existing and proposed square footages (gross, as defined in Planning Code Section 102) for the following features:

- Residential Uses
- Commercial/Retail Uses
- Office Use
- Industrial/PDR Uses
- Parking, including number of spaces
- Bicycle parking, including number of spaces
- Usable Open Space
- Better Roofs Ordinance, including total roof area, living roof area, and solar ready zone area
- For projects with new residential units, the following additional information shall be provided in the project summary on the Title Sheet:
  - Number of market rate dwelling-units
  - Number of on-site affordable dwelling-units (BMR)
  - Dwelling-unit mix (number of studio, 1bd, 2bd, 3+bd)

## Site Survey

Site surveys are required for new buildings, or as requested by Planning Staff, and must be signed by a licensed surveyor registered in California. A site plan cannot substitute for the site survey.

The following must be included:

- Scale: 1/8"=1'-0" or 1" = 10'-0" unless the project is too large to accommodate the 1/8"=1'-0" scale
- The full width of all buildings on adjacent lots
- The front setback of all adjacent buildings
- Curb elevation in line with the mid-point of the subject building and adjacent lots
- Grade elevations at the mid-point of the front wall of adjacent buildings
- Roof elevations including the elevation of eaves and peaks of pitched roofs
- Contour lines
- Utility lines, landscaping, street trees, existing structures on the site, etc.
- North arrow

## Site Plan

The site plan must be dimensioned to show significant measurements and signed by the preparer. It must show both existing and proposed development on the subject lot and all development on those lots used to compute the maximum depth of the project pursuant to the requirements of the Planning Code. In most cases, separate existing and proposed site plans should be provided. Preferably, the existing and proposed site plans should be on the same page, if possible. It must include:

- Scale: 1/8"=1'-0" or 1"=10'-0" unless the project is too large to accommodate the 1/8"=1'-0" scale
- The full width of all buildings on adjacent lots
- Heights (in feet and number of stories, calculated as defined in Planning Code Sections 102 and 260) of buildings and any difference in elevation due to pitched roofs or steps in building mass
- Existing and proposed curb cuts, curb lines, including both adjacent properties
- Dimensioned landscaped areas. Please also include permeability area calculations
- Dimensioned setback requirements including front setback, rear yard, and side yard of the subject and adjacent buildings
- North arrow

## Floor and Roof Plans

Existing and proposed floor and roof plans are required. Preferably, the existing and proposed floor plans should be on the same page, if possible. All plans must be dimensioned to show significant measurements and show all of the following information:

- Scale: 1/4"=1'-0" unless the project is too large to accommodate the 1/4"=1'-0" scale, but a minimum of 1/8" = 1'-0"
- Annotations identifying the existing and intended use of rooms
- Annotations identifying (E) and (N) toter storage (garbage/recycling/compost)
- All walls, those to remain and those to be removed or added, along with a key. If substantial amounts of demolition are proposed, include demolition calculations pursuant to Planning Code Section 317
- All stairs showing the direction of ascent or descent
- All doors and windows, existing and proposed
- The total roof area, living roof area, and/or solar ready zone area in GSF, existing and proposed
- North arrow

## Elevations

Elevations are needed of each building face related to the work for which the application is being sought. The type of building materials on all wall surfaces and for windows and doors should be indicated. Profiles of adjacent buildings that show the full outline of each adjacent building are required in certain instances; refer to the Permit Application Checklist. Side elevations should show the full profile of the adjacent buildings, window openings, and light wells that face the project. Show the grade plane and heights of the buildings. All significant measurements must be dimensioned and a north arrow provided. The height limit should also be indicated on the elevation.

## Sections

Sections through critical points of the proposed building should be provided to clarify the plans. All significant measurements must be dimensioned. At least two sections (longitudinal and lateral) are required for all expansions or if excavation is involved (i.e. ground floor development). For longitudinal sections, show the relation between the street, front property line, subject building, rear yard and rear property line; for lateral sections, show the relation between the subject building and the outline of each adjacent building. The following additional information should be provided on each section:

- Scale: 1/4"=1'-0" unless the project is too large to accommodate the 1/4"=1'-0" scale
- Height datum point: center line of the building, top of curb.
- Indicate floor to ceiling height dimensions
- Illustrate existing and proposed grade
- Key section location on the floor plans and site plan
- North arrow

## **Landscaping Plan**

For large projects, as defined in Planning Code Section 138.1(c)(2), and for other projects as requested by Planning Staff, a landscaping plan with significant measurements dimensioned must show details such as curbs, materials, plant species, and size of any trees. Please also include drip lines.

## **Streetscape Plan**

Projects that require Street Design Advisory Team (SDAT) review due to Better Streets Plan (Section 138.1) requirements, Vision Zero, Privately-Owned Public Open Spaces (POPOS) that are in the public ROW, or any other reason are required to submit the following streetscape plan details with the project's first Development Application. This should include existing and proposed conditions of the following elements:

- Dimensions of existing and proposed sidewalk and curb extensions on plans
- Dimensions of existing and proposed curb cuts and on-street loading zones on plans, if applicable
- Dimensions of existing and proposed transit stops, if applicable
- Existing and proposed streetscape features (e.g. bulbouts, paving materials, trees, transit shelters, benches, bike racks)
- Adjacent ROW widths and curb-to-curb widths
- Locations of existing utility poles and hydrants
- Street sections, including dimensions of tree wells and path of travel
- Should the project be required to install a curb extension at the corner, turn templates will be required before final SDAT approval.

## **Detailed Vicinity Plan**

For large projects, as defined in Planning Code Section 138.1(c)(2), and for other large projects as requested by Planning Staff, a detailed vicinity plan should be provided for an area three blocks in each direction from the furthest project boundary line, indicating: buildings, landscape, hardscape, parking areas, curb cuts, and street trees.

## **Material Specifications**

Provide general design details, descriptions of doors and windows including dimensions, operation (double-hung, casement etc.), and materials and finishes for all exterior surfaces. If materials and operation are clearly visible on the provided illustration, a separate schedule may not be required. Any new window visible from the street will require a window section with dimensions. Be sure to include muntin specifications on window details.

## **Photographs**

The application must be accompanied by photographs. Each photograph or image montage should be clearly labeled to indicate the relation to the subject property. Refer to the Permit Application Checklist to determine which photographs are required for your type of application.

## **Renderings**

To facilitate understanding of your project, a 3-D representation of your project in relation to its context is strongly recommended for all projects.

In addition, all new construction projects require the submittal of a 3-D rendering as a submittal requirement for the Planning Commission. For large projects, as defined in Planning Code Section 138.1(c) (2), as well as on an as-needed basis, submittals should include renderings with both day and night views.

## **Helpful Tools**

Although not required as part of the Plan Submittal, the following additional graphic tools may aid the Planning Department, Commission, and public in fully understanding your proposal relative to surrounding development:

- For projects involving new construction or exterior alterations, a digital 3D representation of the project and its context
- For large projects, a 3D representation of all projects within the three-block vicinity, noting the zoning, as well as the heights of existing and proposed buildings



## San Francisco Planning

**FOR MORE INFORMATION:**

Contact San Francisco Planning

**San Francisco Planning Reception**

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

TEL: **628.652.7600**  
WEB: **[www.sfplanning.org](http://www.sfplanning.org)**

**Planning Counter at Permit Center**

49 South Van Ness Avenue, 2nd Floor  
San Francisco CA 94103

EMAIL: **[pic@sfgov.org](mailto:pic@sfgov.org)**  
TEL: **628.652.7300**