

# SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING COMMISSION



## Meeting Minutes Remote Hearing via video and teleconferencing

**Thursday, January 21, 2021  
1:00 p.m.  
Regular Meeting**

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

**THE MEETING WAS CALLED TO ORDER BY PRESIDENT KOPPEL AT 1:03 PM**

**STAFF IN ATTENDANCE:** Megan Calpin, Deborah Landis, Diego Sanchez, Bridget Hicks, Matt Dito, Claire Feeney, Gabriela Pantoja, Michael Christensen, Rich Hillis – Planning Director, Jonas P. Ionin – Commission Secretary

**SPEAKER KEY:**

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

**A. CONSIDERATION OF ITEMS PROPOSED FOR CONTINUANCE**

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

1. 2020-002743DRP (D. WINSLOW: (628) 652-7335)  
1555 OAK STREET – between Masonic and Central Streets; Lot 028A in Assessor's Block 1222 (District 5) – Request for **Discretionary Review** of Building Permit 2020.0226.5525 to add three new ADUs to an existing four-story 12-unit residential building within a RM-2 (Residential-Mixed, Moderate Density) Zoning District and 40-X Height and Bulk District.

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

*Preliminary Recommendation: Do Not Take Discretionary Review and Approve*

(Continued from Regular hearing on December 3, 2020)

**(Proposed for Continuance to March 11, 2021)**

SPEAKERS: None

ACTION: Continued to March 11, 2021

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

2. 2020-010342DRP (D. WINSLOW: (628) 652-7335)  
3543 Pierce Street – between Beach and Capra Streets; Lot 042 in Assessor's Block 0041B (District 2) – Request for **Discretionary Review** of Building Permit No. 2020.1023.7276 for the revision of the approved site and addendum permit 2017-1228-7576-SR2 and 201712287576-S1 address 3543 Pierce Street to address N.O.V #202056511. Revision only to correct/clarify building height to an existing three-story, two-unit building within a RH-3 (Residential-House, Three-Family) Zoning District and 40-X Height and Bulk District. This action constitutes the Approval Action for the project for the purposes of CEQA, pursuant to San Francisco Administrative Code Section [31.04\(h\)](#).

**WITHDRAWN**

SPEAKERS: None

ACTION: Withdrawn

3. 2019-021369DRP (D. WINSLOW: (628) 652-7335)  
468 JERSEY STREET – between Castro and Diamond Streets; Lot 021 in Assessor's Block 6506 (District 8) – Request for **Discretionary Review** of Building Permit No. 2019.1112.7059 to construct a two-story horizontal rear addition and roof deck to an existing three-story, single-family house within a RH-2 (Residential-House, Two-Family) Zoning District and 40-X Height and Bulk District. This action constitutes the Approval Action for the project for the purposes of CEQA, pursuant to San Francisco Administrative Code Section [31.04\(h\)](#).

*Preliminary Recommendation: Do Not Take Discretionary Review and Approve*

**WITHDRAWN**

SPEAKERS: None

ACTION: Withdrawn

13. [2013.1535CUA-02](#) (M. BOUDREAUX: (628) 652-7375)  
450-474 O'FARRELL STREET AND 532 JONES STREET – on the block bounded by Geary Street to the north, O'Farrell Street to the south, Taylor Street to the east, and Jones Street to the west (Assessor's block/lot 0317/007, 0317/009, and 0317/011) (District 6) – Request to amend **Conditions of Approval** of Planning Commission Motion No. 20281, adopted September 13, 2018. A revised project scope still includes demolition of the three buildings, construction of a 13-story mixed-use building with similar massing, ground floor commercial and a new church, but now proposes up to 302 group housing rooms instead of up to 176 residential units and no longer proposes residential off-street parking. At minimum, Conditions of Approval Nos. 24, 25, 26, 32, pursuant to Planning Code Sections 303, 304, 415, 166, and 155, are to be amended to reflect the project revision and status, for a project located in a RC-4 (Residential- Commercial, High Density) Zoning District, North of

Market Residential Special Use District and 80-130-T Height and Bulk District. This project has undergone environmental review pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act and Chapter 31 of the San Francisco Administrative Code. The Planning Commission certified the Final Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the project on September 13, 2018 (Motion No. 20279). On December 21, 2020, the Planning Department published an addendum to Final EIR for the Project. No further environmental review is required.

*Preliminary Recommendation: Approve Amendments*

(Continued from Regular hearing on January 7, 2021)

SPEAKERS: Richard – Continuance  
Ela Strong – Continuance  
Greg – Continuance

ACTION: Continued to February 4, 2021

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

16. [2019-022661CUA](#) (C. FEENEY: (628) 652- 7313)  
628 SHOTWELL STREET – west side of Shotwell Street between 20<sup>th</sup> and 21<sup>st</sup> Street, Lot 026 of Assessor’s Block 3611 (District 9) – Request for **Conditional Use Authorization** pursuant to Planning Code Sections 209.1 and 303 and Board of Supervisors File No. 190908, to change the use of a Residential Care Facility to two dwelling units within a RH-3 (Residential-House, Three- Family) Zoning District and 40-X Height and Bulk District. This action constitutes the Approval Action for the project for the purposes of CEQA, pursuant to San Francisco Administrative Code Section [31.04\(h\)](#).

*Preliminary Recommendation: Approve with Conditions*

(Continued from Regular hearing on November 19, 2020)

SPEAKERS: None

ACTION: Continued March 18, 2021

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

18. [2018-014795ENX](#) (M. CHRISTENSEN: (628) 652-7567)  
1560 FOLSOM STREET – irregular lot bounded by Folsom, 11<sup>th</sup>, and Kissling Streets; Lots 009, 066-068 in Assessor’s Block 3516 (District 6) – Request for **Large Project Authorization**, pursuant to Planning Code Sections 329, 813, 823, and 844 for a Project which proposes to demolish five existing Industrial buildings at the project site, merge four existing lots into two new lots, vacate a portion of Burns Place (a public alleyway), and construct two new buildings at the site. The first building, fronting Kissling Street, is proposed as a seven-story, 83.5’, 65,575 sq ft residential building containing 56 dwelling units and 36 off-street auto parking spaces. The second building, fronting Folsom and 11<sup>th</sup> Streets, is proposed as an eight-story, 85’ tall, 200,049 sq ft mixed-use building containing 188 dwelling units and 47 off-street auto parking spaces. The subject property is within the WMUG (Western SoMa Mixed-Use General) and RED (Residential Enclave) Zoning Districts, Western SoMa Special Use District, and 40-X and 55-X Height and Bulk Districts. The proposed Project would utilize the State Density Bonus Law (California Government Code Sections 65915-65918) and proposes waivers for: the Height Limit (PC 260), Rear Yard (PC 134), Dwelling Unit Exposure (PC 140), Narrow Streets Height Limit (PC 261.1), and Horizontal Mass Reduction (PC 270.1) requirements of the Planning Code. This action constitutes the Approval Action for the project for the purposes of CEQA, pursuant to San Francisco Administrative Code Section [31.04\(h\)](#).

*Preliminary Recommendation: Approve with Conditions*  
(Continued from Regular hearing on December 17, 2020)

SPEAKERS: None  
ACTION: Continued to February 4, 2021  
AYES: Tanner, Chan, Diamond, Fung, Imperial, Moore, Koppel

**B. CONSENT CALENDAR**

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

4. [2014.0243DRP-02](#) (D. WINSLOW: (628) 652-7335)  
[3927-3929 19<sup>TH</sup> STREET](#) – between Sanchez and Noe Streets; Lots 072 and 073 in Assessor's Block 3601 (District 8) – Request for **Discretionary Review** of Building Permit nos. 2008.0813.9076 and 2008.0813.9077 for the construction of a two new five-story single-dwelling units with two off-street parking spaces at the front of a 2,850 sq. ft. lot containing an existing two-story, single-family residence with no off-street parking which will remain unchanged within a RH-2 (Residential-House, Two-Family) Zoning District and 40-X Height and Bulk District. This action constitutes the Approval Action for the project for the purposes of CEQA, pursuant to San Francisco Administrative Code Section [31.04\(h\)](#).  
*Preliminary Recommendation: Take Discretionary Review and Approve as Modified*  
(Continued from Regular hearing on January 7, 2021)

SPEAKERS: None  
ACTION: Took DR and Approved as Modified  
AYES: Tanner, Chan, Diamond, Fung, Imperial, Moore, Koppel  
DRA: [733](#)

5. [2020-010132CUA](#) (M. CHRISTENSEN: (628) 652-7567)  
[150 7<sup>TH</sup> STREET](#) – between Natoma and Minna Streets; Lot 004 in Assessor's Block 3727 (District 6) - Request for **Conditional Use Authorization**, pursuant to Planning Code Sections 303 and 844, for the establishment of a 6,215 square foot Assembly and Social Service Use (West Bay Pilipino Multiservice Center) within the existing two-story commercial building located within the WMUG (Western SoMa Mixed-Use General) Zoning District, Western SoMa Special Use District, and 55-X Height and Bulk District. This action constitutes the Approval Action for the project for the purposes of CEQA, pursuant to San Francisco Administrative Code Section [31.04\(h\)](#).  
*Preliminary Recommendation: Approve with Conditions*

SPEAKERS: None  
ACTION: Approved with Conditions  
AYES: Tanner, Chan, Diamond, Fung, Imperial, Moore, Koppel  
MOTION: [20835](#)

**C. COMMISSION MATTERS**

6. Consideration of Adoption:
- [Draft Minutes for January 7, 2021](#)

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

7. Commission Comments/Questions

**Commissioner Moore:**

I wanted to check with the rest of my fellow Commissioners in this particular round of reviewing projects. I ran, due to the size of my computer, which is a normal tablet, I ran into great difficulties given the size of drawings and the enormity of information that need to be processed. And, I am wondering, also running this by Director Hillis, as to whether or not we could start selectively to get hard copies of significantly large projects. O'Farrell, Folsom as well, as unfortunately, the Department's Budget Review pose major problems in reviewing this time and as we are now going into our 36<sup>th</sup> or 38<sup>th</sup> virtual hearing, I think we may have to use an interim provision to receive paper copies on these large projects. I'm wondering how other Commissioners feel about that. Both the Staff can comment [Inaudible] or Mr. Ionin himself is fine.

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

Yes. I mean, we can certainly look into doing this. There would, maybe, be a possibility to reinstate hard copies being issued to the Commissioners directly from reprographics. I mean, maybe we can have that, so that, staff can adhere to the shelter-in-place and only go into the office for emergency purposes, but we can certainly look into that Commissioner Moore.

**Commissioner Moore:**

I'd greatly appreciate that.

**Commissioner Diamond:**

I wanted to emphatically underscore Commissioner Moore's point. I am having a terrible time reviewing the drawings on an iPad or even on a small laptop. The narrative portion is fine but the actual drawings, I have to shrink it so small in order to see everything that's on and that it's really hard to read all of the notes on it. So, I, you know, especially to the drawings, I have previously indicated the same desire for CEQA documents for draft EIRs and response to comments. Jonas, your Department has been great about getting those to me. I don't know if the other Commissioners feel the same way, but in reviewing those, it's nice to have hard copies.

I'd also like to make a -- as long as we're talking about the drawings. It seems like every applicant submits their drawings in a slightly different format. Sometimes the proposed and existing are around the same page; sometimes they are pages apart; sometimes we get 3D models, which are very helpful; sometimes we don't. And I'm wondering if an effort can be made if other Commissioners feel the same way, to figure out what works best for us in our review and let those become criteria. There may have been efforts led to do this in the past

and I don't know what the current status is, but I would be very interested in hearing other Commissioners' thoughts on this.

**Commissioner Imperial:**

I also support Commissioner Diamond and Commissioner Moore's on the hard copies. As far as I know, the EIR is something we requested but it not something that's mandatory. Maybe those are things that I think is very important and in terms of the drawings, yes, it's a lot of going back and forth on my end as well. And when it comes to other very important documents that involves policy or the long-range developments, those things as well I feel like may need some more hard copies for myself. This is something that we'll talk about later on but the budget is an example that I was having a hard time to just piece everything in. So, I support. I guess if I would try to prioritize hard copies, the EIRs, the land use or long-range development plans or -- and also big or large projects probably something we should consider as well. I'm not sure about the Discretionary Review but actually there are those graphics as well In the Discretionary Review that sometimes I also have a hard time looking into those pictures as well.

**Commissioner Moore:**

I just want to briefly comment on Commissioner Diamond and Commissioner Imperial's comment. In the past, it is quite a few years back, previous Commissions had issues with inconsistencies of drawing submittals. Some people do a great job. Others do a less desirable and hard to understand job. And it's hard without adding lot of extra work to people's submittals, making too overly precise demands. However, there is a basic standard which at that time was summarized in Submittal Guidelines and I think it's still on the Planning Commission's website where there was a little bit more consistency. And I think this may be the time to slowly review what was asked then and see if we still stand with that. And then have staff basically direct for information that is required from all and not just from some: that is the 3D, that is the description of materials, some samples if possible. It's some very simple tweaks but we have gone so far to sub-standard submittals that I think reconsideration of that at the top among Commissioners [inaudible].

**Rich Hillis, Planning Director:**

And to Commissioner Moore's point, we can send out -- Commissioner Moore, I think you were very helpful in creating the Plan Submittal Guidelines so others can see it and get your feedback.

**Commissioner Moore:**

Thank you, Director Hillis. At that time, we very careful with [inaudible] not to overburden people. It needs to have standard that meets the minimum level of expectations.

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

And I will certainly convey this message and request to staff during our weekly Commission Cases meeting and see if Staff can just start being a little more diligent in plan review when they come to the Commission.

**Commissioner Fung:**

I'm okay with either way. Whether it's electronic or hard copy. I have a 30-inch monitor and a touch screen on my computer. So, either way works for me.

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

We won't send you any hard copies Commissioner Fung.

**Commissioner Fung:**

Okay.

**Commissioner Tanner:**

I was going to second Commissioner Fung for myself. As we roll out how hard copy works, maybe there's some items where I want that but generally, I'm okay with electronic. So, I will make it a special request to proactively ask that for myself.

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

Thank you, I appreciate that. I will poll the Commissioners before we start sending large packets to your -- whichever receiving address you gave us.

8. Election of Officers: In accordance with the Rules and Regulations of the San Francisco Planning Commission, the President and Vice President of the Commission shall be elected at the first Regular Meeting of the Commission held on or after the 15<sup>th</sup> day of January of each year, or at a subsequent meeting, the date which shall be fixed by the Commission at the first Regular Meeting on or after the 15<sup>th</sup> day of January each year.

SPEAKERS: None

ACTION: Koppel - President, Moore - Vice President

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

#### **D. DEPARTMENT MATTERS**

9. Director's Announcements

**Rich Hillis, Planning Director:**

Good afternoon Commissioners. First of all, congratulations. Smooth election restored by faith and democracy. I just wanted to give you -- I emailed out a letter earlier today from Mayor Breed and Supervisors Ronen, Mar and Mandelman that was sent to ABAG and MTC regarding Plan Bay Area 2050 which as you know is the long range regional plan and it focuses on Housing, Environment, Transportation, and the Economy. The plan allocates growth of households and jobs in the region to counties and cities and it is part of the methodology that we use to allocate -- to make the RHNA allocation. It's ultimately approved by MTC and ABAG which will happen later this year, but the draft of the plan, that was released in December (an original, an earlier draft had been released in the summer) this is the final draft, gave us some concerns and concerns to the Mayor and the Supervisors. And ultimately shifting a growth into San Francisco is about a 53% increase in allocation from new households to San Francisco. So, from about 139,000 to 213,000 households over the plan period, which is to 2050 and we're not the only city being affected. There are definitely others that are getting increases but we are probably the most significant. I think one of the bigger issues we had is where the growth is being allocated from and where it's being allocated to in San Francisco. So that ABAG and MTC divide the city into quadrants. So, again most of the increases coming in from the Southeast section of the city which as you know have seen a lot of growth and has gentrification and displacement, pressures, housing many of our communities of color and vulnerable population. So, that gave us

concern and that a lot of the growth is being shifted out of more higher resource jobs which communities along the peninsula. So, you'll see kind of those issues being outlined in the article. And one of the principals I think of Plan Bay Area was to further better housing and minimize displacements, so again, we have concerns about this shift. ABAG taking this up tomorrow and voting on the preferred alternative for their EIR to study this, and then MTC takes it up next week, then ultimately adopted later this year after the EIR is certified. So, I just wanted to bring that to your attention because it's moving kind of fast.

And then second item, the MOU for UCSF that you heard in a couple of commission meetings ago was approved by a Committee of the Board of Regents for UC. It's on their calendar for today, I think, for the full Regents. There have been some changes made to it and I think aligns with some of the concerns you have, so there's been shifts in the commitment to Affordable Housing to various AMIs. So before, you'll remember 50% of the new housing -- or 50% of -- that 40% affordable housing was designated AMI levels below 90% and the other 50% below 120%. Those have been revised to have 50% below 80% AMI, 25% between 80% and 125% between 100% and 120%. So, we've seen some improvements to the Affordable Housing in targeting lower AMIs. So, I just wanted to give you that. Thank you.

**Commissioner Moore:**

Director Hillis, the letter you sent came in relatively recently and I only glanced at it, but it somewhat took my breath away. I have to [inaudible]. It seems as if there are people pulling strings that do not seem to reflect on reality. You very politely described what's happening but who's pulling the strings here? Is San Francisco not properly represented with these two agencies? It seems as if there's somewhere up there of governing on the top down rather than deal with the realities of a city that is severely impacted not just by COVID but by goals expectations which is limited land resources and a high degree of vulnerable communities are very very difficult to handle. We are building large amounts of housing. It seems to me that we are leading the region. And I'm just trying to politely ask that I get a little bit more background of what is -- where and why this is done useful.

**Rich Hillis, Planning Director:**

And I think you're exactly right. We're trying to understand that and tell -- I mean this is the latest draft which is considered the final draft that came out just before the holidays in December, or before the holidays in December. So, we're trying to understand how this shift was made and I think there's a couple of things going on. They've got a model that they use to model future growth and their strategies that are put into the model in land use assumptions that are made. So, it's been a little difficult for us to get answers to exactly how this happened. I mean I think it was a combination of shifting growth to meet greenhouse gas emissions. Closer to cities that have significant amounts of transit. Some of this seems to be due to a mistake made about how they accounted for our pipeline projects. There are some assumptions we're seeing now though about redevelopment of multifamily housing sites in almost a preference for that over redeveloping single-family home site. So, we're trying to understand that as well and understand why this shift happened so we can better articulate what our technical reasons why we don't think that should happen and the policy reason behind it. So, we will be articulating that at ABAG this evening and in MTC but we will also be meeting with staff to try to exactly understand that.



**Commissioner Moore:**

So, you will personally be representing us and --

**Rich Hillis, Planning Director:**

I am a representative of ABAG for the Mayor. Supervisor Mar and Mandelman are on the ABAG as well. And Supervisor Ronen is on the MTC. [Inaudible] who's the Mayor's representative is also on the MTC.

**Commissioner Moore:**

So, we have an excellent representation to already push back and amend letters appropriate to changes that have occurred and were [Inaudible]

**Rich Hillis, Planning Director:**

Yes. And certainly, these are not large commissions. So, we can't control what happens necessarily at the Commission, but I think we've got some good policy rationale why we don't think this shift is appropriate.

**Commissioner Moore:**

Thank you so much for explaining that.

**Rich Hillis, Planning Director:**

You're welcome.

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

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

There is no report from the Board of Supervisors or the Board of Appeals. However, the Historic Preservation Commission did meet yesterday, where they heard the proposed Department Budget and Work Program, which you will be hearing next. As well as initiating or adopted a resolution recommending initiation of landmarking the Casa Sanchez Building at 2778 24<sup>th</sup> Street and the Mission Cultural Center at 2868 Mission Street.

**E. GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT**

SPEAKERS: Georgia Schuttish – 1/17/21 Chronicle article on 2626 Filbert, demolition vs deconstruction, demo calcs

**F. REGULAR CALENDAR**

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

11. [2020-010430CRV](#) (D. LANDIS: (628) 652-7526)  
**FY 2021-2023 PROPOSED DEPARTMENT BUDGET AND WORK PROGRAM** – an **Informational Presentation** of the Department's proposed revenue and expenditure budget in FY 2021-2022 and FY2022-2023, including grants; high-level work program activities for the Department in FY 2021-2022 and FY2022-2023; and proposed dates where budget items will be discussed during the budget process.  
*Preliminary Recommendation: None – Informational*
- SPEAKERS: = Rich Hillis – Introduction  
= Megan Calpin – Staff Presentation  
= Deborah Landis – Staff Presentation  
= Brett Gladstone – Geary Street and 3<sup>rd</sup> Street upzoning
- ACTION: Reviewed and Commented
12. [2020-006803PCA](#) (D. SANCHEZ: (628) 652-7253)  
**CODE CORRECTIONS 2020** – initiation of **Planning Code Amendments** to correct typographical errors, update outdated cross-references, and make non-substantive revisions to clarify or simplify Code language; affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act; making findings of consistency with the General Plan, and the eight priority policies of Planning Code, Section 101.1; and adopting findings of public necessity, convenience, and general welfare under Planning Code, Section 302  
*Preliminary Recommendation: Initiate and schedule a public hearing on or after February 11, 2021*
- SPEAKERS: = Diego Sanchez – Staff Presentation
- ACTION: Initiated and Scheduled a hearing on or after February 11, 2021.
- AYES: Tanner, Chan, Diamond, Fung, Imperial, Moore, Koppel
- RESOLUTION: [20836](#)
- 14a. [2016-008743CUA](#) (B. HICKS: (628) 652-7528)  
**446-448 RALSTON AVENUE** – east side of Ralston Street between Holloway Avenue and Garfield Street; Lots 035 and 036 in Assessor's Block 6995 (District 11) – Request for **Conditional Use Authorization**, pursuant to Planning Code Sections 303 and 317 to authorize the tantamount demolition a single-family home that straddles two lots within a RH-1 (Residential-House, One-Family) Zoning District, Oceanview Large Residence Special Use District and 40-X Height and Bulk District. The proposal is to construct two single-family homes which will each accommodate an Accessory Dwelling unit for a total of four units on two lots. The existing home operates a State licensed in-home childcare facility for less than 14 children which will be retained within the home of 446 Ralston, Lot 035. The Project also includes the legalization of the play structure at the rear of the property which serves as a rain shelter for the in-home childcare outdoor play area. This action constitutes the Approval Action for the project for the purposes of CEQA, pursuant to San Francisco Administrative Code Section [31.04\(h\)](#).  
*Preliminary Recommendation: Approve with Conditions*
- SPEAKERS: = Bridget Hicks – Staff Report  
+ Yung Chen – Project Sponsor  
- Speaker – Airbnb

- Speaker – Not appropriate use of the space
- Barbara Hornsby – Neighborhood character
- Speaker – No permits
- Georgia Schuttish – Demo calcs makes no sense
- = Corey Teague – Response to questions
- Speaker – Childcare operation, security issue

ACTION: Approved with Conditions as Amended by Staff  
 AYES: Tanner, Chan, Diamond, Fung, Imperial, Moore, Koppel  
 MOTION: [20837](#)

- 14b. [2016-008743VAR](#) (B. HICKS: (628) 652-7528)  
446-448 RALSTON AVENUE – east side of Ralston Street between Holloway Avenue and Garfield Street; Lots 035 and 036 in Assessor's Block 6995 (District 11) – Request for a **Variance** pursuant to Planning Code Section 134 for the legalization of the play structure at the rear of the property which serves as a rain shelter for the in-home childcare outdoor play area. Planning Code Section 134 requires the subject property to maintain a rear yard of approximately 25 feet. The proposed rear structure encroaches approximately 16 feet 3 inches into the required rear yard; therefore, the project requires a rear yard variance.

SPEAKERS: Same as item 14a.  
 ACTION: ZA Closed the PH and took the matter under advisement

15. [2018-015786CUA](#) (M. DITO: (628) 652-7358)  
2750 GEARY BOULEVARD – northeast corner of Geary Boulevard and Wood Street; Lot 001A in Assessor's Block 1070 (District 2) – Request for **Conditional Use Authorization**, pursuant to Planning Code Sections 121.1, 121.2, and 303, to significantly expand a building located on a lot larger than 10,000 square feet, as well as for the expansion of an existing use size greater than 6,000 square feet within the Geary NCD (Neighborhood Commercial District) Zoning District and 40-X Height and Bulk District. The subject property is currently occupied by a residential care facility (d.b.a. Sagebrook Senior Assisted Living) which is considered an institutional use. The project proposes a 9,000 square-foot three-story addition at the rear of the lot to provide 20 additional care-units. There are currently 79 care-units on-site. A 2,400 square-foot two-story activity room is also proposed. This action constitutes the Approval Action for the project for the purposes of CEQA, pursuant to San Francisco Administrative Code Section [31.04\(h\)](#).

*Preliminary Recommendation: Approve with Conditions*

SPEAKERS: = Matt Dito – Staff Report  
 + Joanne Wong – Project Sponsor  
 = Michael – Parking and traffic  
 = Speaker – Parking  
 ACTION: Approved with Conditions as Amended to include a community liaison thru construction and operation of the facility.  
 AYES: Tanner, Chan, Diamond, Fung, Imperial, Moore, Koppel  
 MOTION: [20838](#)

17. [2019-018013CUA](#) (G. PANTOJA: (628) 652-7380)  
2027 20<sup>TH</sup> AVENUE – between Pacheco and Quintara Streets, Lot 004A in Assessor's Block 2140 (District 4) – Request for a **Conditional Use Authorization** pursuant to Planning Code

Sections 303 and 317 for the demolition of an existing one-story, single-family residence and a one-story, detached garage structure and the construction of a new three-story, single-family residence with an Accessory Dwelling Unit pursuant to Planning Code Section 207(c)(6) within a RH-1 (Residential-House, One- Family) Zoning District and 40-X Height and Bulk District. This action constitutes the Approval Action for the project for the purposes of CEQA, pursuant to San Francisco Administrative Code Section [31.04\(h\)](#).

*Preliminary Recommendation: Approve with Conditions*

SPEAKERS: = Gabriela Pantoja – Staff Report  
 + Tom Tunny – Project Sponsor  
 - Eileen Boken – Monster home, scale back  
 ACTION: Approved with Conditions  
 AYES: Tanner, Chan, Diamond, Fung, Imperial, Moore, Koppel  
 MOTION: [20839](#)

19. [2020-006575CUA](#) (M. CHRISTENSEN: (628) 652-7567)  
[560 VALENCIA STREET](#) – west side between 16th and 17th Streets, Lot 009 on Assessor's Block 3568 (District 8) – Request for **Conditional Use Authorization**, pursuant to Planning Code Sections 202.2, 303, and 762, for a change of use from Retail (furniture store) to Cannabis Retail (including an on-site smoking/vaporizing lounge), within a 4,984 sq ft single-story, single-tenant retail space. The project site is located within the Valencia Street NCT (Neighborhood Commercial Transit) Zoning District and 55-X Height and Bulk District. This action constitutes the Approval Action for the project for the purposes of CEQA, pursuant to San Francisco Administrative Code Section [31.04\(h\)](#).

*Preliminary Recommendation: Approve with Conditions*  
 (Continued from Regular hearing on December 3, 2020)

SPEAKERS: = Michael Christensen – Staff Presentation  
 + William Dolan – Project Sponsor  
 + Speaker – Support  
 + Gina Ricks – Support  
 - Larisa Pedroncelli – Organized opposition  
 - Speaker – Organized opposition  
 - Lucia – Organized opposition  
 - Marie Sorensen – Oppose  
 + Jeremy – Support  
 + Alyssa – Support  
 + Roberto Ariel Vargas – Support  
 + Michael Young – Support  
 - Speaker – Existing concentration in the Mission  
 + Daniel – Support  
 + Brian Goodwin – Support  
 + David Goldman – Support  
 + Michael Cohen – Support  
 - Ben Terell – Cannabis tourism  
 - Maria Delamora – Harmful impact on the community  
 + Christopher Christensen – Include labor peace agreement  
 + Brian – Support  
 + Tim Espinoza – Support

- Kelly Hill – Large dispensary
- + Jessica – Approve with a labor peace agreement
- + Bianca Gutierrez – Support
- + Carol Ruiz – Approve with a labor peace agreement
- + Kory Williams – Support
- + Naz – Support
- + Jessica – Support
- + Mario Fernandez - Approve with a labor peace agreement
- + Johnny Delaplane – Support
- + Speaker – Support
- Claude Marsh – Exposure to young people
- + Speaker – Support
- + Kevin Ortiz – Approve with a labor peace agreement
- + Joel – Support
- + Mary Turner – Support
- + Layla – Support
- + John – Support
- = Kate Stacy – City Attorney

ACTION: Approved with Conditions as Amended to include a one-year report-back update hearing with specific attention to the CBA agreement.

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

MOTION: [20840](#)

ADJOURNMENT 5:42 PM  
ADOPTED FEBRUARY 4, 2021