

SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING COMMISSION



Meeting Minutes

Remote Hearing via video and teleconferencing

Thursday, April 1, 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 1:01 PM

STAFF IN ATTENDANCE: Aaron Starr, Linda Ajello-Hoagland, Liz Watty, Chris May, Kimberly Durandet, Claire Feeney, David Winslow, 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. 2020-003223CUA (A. WESTHOFF: (628) 652-7314)
249 TEXAS STREET – east side of Texas Street between 18th and Mariposa Streets: Lot 17A in Assessors Block 4001 (District 10) – Request for a **Conditional Use Authorization**, pursuant to Planning Code 303 and 317 to demolish an existing three-story single-family dwelling and construct a new three-story building containing two-dwelling units within a RH-2 (Residential-House, Two Family) Zoning District and 40-X Height and Bulk District. The new

development would measure approximately 4,361 square feet. 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 March 4, 2021)

Note: On March 4, 2021, after hearing and closing public comment, continued to April 1, 2021 by a vote of +7 -0.

(Proposed for Continuance to April 15, 2021)

SPEAKERS: None

ACTION: Continued to April 15, 2021

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

2. 2013.1535CUA-02 (C. GROB: (628) 652-7532)
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.

Preliminary Recommendation: Approve Amendments

(Continued from Regular hearing on March 11, 2021)

(Proposed for Continuance to April 15, 2021)

SPEAKERS: None

ACTION: Continued to April 15, 2021

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

3. 2013.0614ENX-02 (M. CHRISTENSEN: (628) 652-7567)
600 SOUTH VAN NESS – southeast corner of South Van Ness Avenue at 17th Street; Lots 139-168 of Assessor's Block 3575 (District 9) – Request for **Large Project Authorization**, pursuant to Planning Code Sections 329 and 843, for a Project which requests to amend Condition of Approval Numbers 22-27 of Planning Commission Motion No. 19378 to authorize the recently-constructed five-story, 27-unit residential project to comply with the inclusionary housing requirements of Planning Code Section 415 through the payment of an in-lieu fee rather than by providing four on-site Below Market Rate units. The Project Site is located within a UMU (Urban Mixed Use) Zoning District and 58-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 February 25, 2021)

(Proposed for Continuance to April 22, 2021)

SPEAKERS: None

ACTION: Continued to April 22, 2021

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

4. 2016-000302DRP (D. WINSLOW: (628) 652-7335)
460 VALLEJO STREET – between Kearny and Vallejo Streets; Lot 020 in Assessor’s Block 0133 (District 3) – Request for **Discretionary Review** of Building Permit no. 2019.0402.6906 for extensive interior alteration of the existing two-dwelling unit residence, building recladding removing stucco and replacing with wood siding, and an approximately one foot increase of the rear yard roof height to allow for the creation of a furnished roof deck above. Permit is submitted in partial abatement of Enforcement Case No. 2018-001495ENF for Planning Code violations for work carried out with a permit. Current permit application legalizes building expansion at the rear, proposed fence less than ten-foot high at rear yard, lightwell infills, a 100 square foot garden shed in rear yard, and restoration of roof deck to 12-foot front yard setback 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: Take Discretionary Review and Approve
(Proposed for Indefinite Continuance)

SPEAKERS: None

ACTION: Continued indefinitely

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

7. [2020-006303CUA](#) (D. WEISSGLASS: (628) 652-7307)
2201 POWELL STREET – northwest corner of Powell Street and Francisco Street, Lot 006 on Assessor’s Block 0041 (District 3) – Request for **Conditional Use Authorization**, pursuant to Planning Code Sections 303 and 722, to install a new AT&T Mobility Macro Wireless Telecommunications Services Facility at rooftop consisting of installation of four panel antennas within FRP faux vents; installation of ten remote radio heads; installation of two DC-9 surge suppressors; one GPS antenna; and ancillary equipment as part of the AT&T Mobility Telecommunications Network. The subject property is located within the North Beach NCD (Neighborhood Commercial District), North Beach Special Use, Telegraph Hill-North Beach Residential Special Use, 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: None
 ACTION: Approved with Conditions
 AYES: Tanner, Chan, Fung, Imperial, Moore, Koppel
 RECUSED: Diamond
 MOTION: [20881](#)

5. [2020-011265CUA](#) (M. CHRISTENSEN: (628) 652-7567)
1550 WALLACE AVENUE – northeast side of Wallace Avenue between Jennings and Keith Streets, Lot 027 in Assessor’s Block 4829 (District 10) – Request for **Conditional Use Authorization**, pursuant to Planning Code Sections 202.2, 210.3, and 303, for a Project proposing to establish an 8,500 square foot industrial agriculture facility within the existing industrial building within a PDR-1-B (Production, Distribution, and Repair – Light Industrial Buffer) 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: None
 ACTION: Approved with Conditions
 AYES: Tanner, Chan, Diamond, Fung, Imperial, Moore, Koppel
 MOTION: [20882](#)

6. [2018-013692CUA](#) (C. FEENEY: (628) 652-7313)
2285 JERROLD AVENUE – south side of Jerrold Avenue between Barneveld Avenue; Lot 007A in Assessor’s Block 5286A (District 10) – Request for a **Conditional Use Authorization** pursuant to Planning Code Sections 121.6, 210.3, 210.4, 249.22, 303, and 304 to demolish an existing self-storage facility and construct a new 65-foot tall building that includes a 2,518 square foot commercial restaurant space on the corner, 174,663 square feet of commercial storage space on floors one to four and 120,000 square feet of self-storage space on floors four to six, within a PDR-2 (Core Production, Distribution, and Repair) Zoning District, Industrial Protection Zone Special Use District, and 65-J 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: [20883](#)

C. COMMISSION MATTERS

8. Consideration of Adoption:
- [Draft Minutes for March 18, 2021](#)

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

9. Commission Comments/Questions

Commissioner Moore:

I wanted to ask the Department as to whether or not the group that is looking at Social and Racial Equity has been looking at the 2021 Inclusion Equity Bill issued by the State of California. There is one called ACA1 and SCA1. That is been coming the forefront and I would like us to stay on top of it in order to inform ourselves what is being discussed and under what particular subject headings. There was another bill I heard about and that is called the Social Housing Bill referenced as AB387. As we are looking for other tools and finding financing for inclusionary housing or affordable housing, I'd like to see as to whether or not that applies in any form or shape to us here in San Francisco. That is all. Thank you.

Commissioner Imperial:

Thank you, Commissioner Moore and President Koppel. I have more of a follow up to Director Hillis regarding the SB330 as to, if, what's the status of that and when, if ever we can have a presentation or some sort of report in terms of the local implementation of the SB330 especially when it comes to continuances. So, I know if perhaps, if there's a timeline when the Planning Commission can have some sort of presentation on the SB330 local implementation, that would be great. That's all.

Rich Hillis, Planning Director:

On both those items, as we do, every year, we're tracking the bills. Many again are kind of related to housing issues. So, you know, it's a little tricky because these works their way through the process, some just fall off and get amended significantly. So, I'm happy to schedule in the next couple of weeks or months to have a discussion or just to give you a briefing on those bills.

Commissioner Imperial:

Just my point is these, since we've heard comments about the definition or clarification of continuances and we continue to have continuances, I think it's good to have,, an immediate clarification on that so that we are you know implementing the SB330 properly for our jurisdiction.

Commissioner Tanner:

Thank you. I just want to bring up something we've talked about before but with continuing application for cannabis dispensaries. I still remain concerned about the overall inflow; it's certainly great to see empty store fronts becoming not empty anymore and to be providing more equity in the geographic distribution of cannabis dispensaries, but I am concerned that, you know just looking back in history, we're kind of repeating ourselves. So, I don't want to equate cannabis with cigarettes, but cigarettes used to be sold everywhere and now we have rules in the city that [inaudible] diminished the number of locations where cigarettes are sold. Same thing with alcohol sales, we have controls trying to diminish the amount of alcohol sales in locations. I just wonder, at what point, are we as the Commission and if anybody on the Board is thinking about having actual caps for different areas of the city. We can distribute to equity and still have so many. Those challenges in the industry in

terms of saturation and, then also, I just worry at some point we'll be kind of rolled back and telling folks they can't renew their business license or they can't have their business anymore because now we decide they're out of fashion and it's too many in the city. It's hard to make a decision just on each cannabis dispensary. We can certainly look at the merits of it, the situation of that building, its location, its proximity to other locations but I still feel at a loss for thinking kind of comprehensively about the distribution of cannabis dispensaries across the city and I don't know if other Commissioners share my concern, but I guess I'm looking, Director, to understand what we can do at this level? You know, understanding Obviously, the Board would have to create caps or any other type of refinement to the location that dispensaries can be allowed. So would love to hear if other Commissioners are interested in this and from the Director what we can do on this from the Commission.

Commissioner Imperial:

Thank you, Commissioner Tanner for bringing that up. That's also what I think we've had that discussion before and we have brought that up in terms of the racial and social equity of the make-up of the cannabis retail and even with the Office of Cannabis itself the question about equity. You know, I think right now, we have a cap of about four applicants that can establish a cannabis retail and I think that's a good question for Office of Cannabis and also for us to look into the racial and social equity make-up of it and what kind of cannabis retail are we – you know. I know in planning, we always talk about the use and not the user, but if we're talking about, you know, a big corporation will be that something is considered as a form of equity even though we have scattered it somewhere. So it's a good type for us to look into it, but yeah, I do share your sentiment, Commissioner Tanner.

Rich Hillis, Planning Director:

Commissioner Tanner, just a follow up too, we can certainly schedule a time to talk to you all. Obviously, the rules are relatively new on cannabis retail, but there are limits on where retailers can go. There's the green zone that's kind of in response to the 300--the radius around schools, you know, they're kind of educational facilities and then there's the clustering rules as well, which have limited where retailers can go and so we can certainly show you where they have gone and where applications are and invite the Office of Cannabis back too to talk about this globally again.

Commissioner Tanner:

Thank you, Director Hillis.

Commissioner Moore:

I do share Commissioner Tanner's concern that particularly during this time with the large vacancies and sensitive commercial corridors that permitting too many of them would produce what I call the Starbucks phenomenon. Many, many, many, many years ago, everybody thought Starbucks would be the cure for urbanity and it's so much went a different way. I'm just going to leave it at that because we're not supposed to have discussions about something which is not on the agenda. I'll leave it at that.

D. DEPARTMENT MATTERS

10. Director's Announcements

Rich Hillis, Planning Director:

Good afternoon Commissioners, again, just two items: one I sent an e-mail earlier today about a ribbon cutting that you can stream, it's next Friday, or next Thursday actually at 5. It's the first installment of the Excelsior Street Scape Pilot Project which I think many of you have heard about from being a commissioner. I think Commissioner Tanner, you worked on when you were here in the Department. There's a temporary public space art installation that's being installed at Mission and Geneva that we partnered with Youth Art Exchange as a part of and comes out of our Excelsior Mission structure. So, take a look at that, and attend if you can.

I also wanted to let you know as we move closer to the yellow tier, many of our staff are receiving vaccines, we are working with the Permit Center staff and DBI staff to plan for expanded in-person services at the Permit Center in transitioning from, you know, the current process to over-the-counter to in-person services. So, we'll be updating you on that more in the coming weeks and that's all I have. Thanks.

11. Review of Past Events at the Board of Supervisors, Board of Appeals, Environmental Review Officer Hearing and Historic Preservation Commission

Lisa Gibson, Environmental Review Officer:

Good afternoon, Commissioners.

I am Lisa Gibson, Environmental Review Officer. I'm here today to report on a decision I issued pertaining to an appeal of a prior environmental determination I made regarding the Recreation and Parks Department's Observation Wheel. I'm presenting this to you because Chapter 31 of the Administrative Code requires that an oral report on this type of decision be presented to the Planning Commission at the next possible meeting after such decision.

As you may be aware, the observation wheel is part of RPD's Golden Gate Park 150th Anniversary Celebration project. The wheel is located in the Music Concourse, which is an Article 10 landmark and is located in the National Register and California Register Golden Gate Park Historic District. It was originally proposed to be in operation for one year and was recently proposed to be in operation for a total of five years.

Back in December of 2019, the Planning Department issued a Class 1 and 3 categorical exemption for the original project pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act. This finding was based on substantial evidence in the record that the project fit within classes of projects that the state legislature determined could not have a significant effect on the environment. Further, we found that no exceptions were triggered that would make the project ineligible for a categorical exemption. At that time, operation of the wheel was proposed for one year, although our determination was not dependent on the duration of operation.

On February 9, 2021, the Department determined that the proposed four-year extension would not constitute a substantial modification to the project that requires reevaluation pursuant to Section 31.08(i) of Chapter 31 of the SF Administrative Code. There was no information in the record demonstrating that the originally approved project met the definition of a substantial modification as defined in the code.

On February 19, 2021, Katherine Howard of the San Francisco Group of the Sierra Club, filed an appeal of the Planning Department's no substantial modification determination to the ERO.

I'll note that this was the first time such an appeal has ever been filed. Appeals of this type are allowed pursuant to Admin Code Sect 31.08(j). As noted therein, such an appeal is not an appeal of a CEQA decision under that state law. In addition, such appeals shall not delay or suspend any permit approval or other discretionary approval authorizing the change in the project or suspend any construction activity.

Returning to the subject of my report on this particular appeal, On March 11, 2021, I held a public hearing for the appeal that challenged the department's no substantial modification determination for the observation wheel. The appeal primarily raised concerns related to the nighttime lighting of the wheel. The appellant argued that an additional four years of operation would have a significant impact on historic resources, biological resources, and other environmental topics.

After carefully considering the appeal, on March 25th I issued a memorandum that upheld the Department's determination that the revised project does not constitute a substantial modification and that there is no new information demonstrating that the originally approved project no longer qualifies for the exemption.

The Department determined that the project met the Secretary of the Interior Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties and determined that impacts related to historic resources would be less than significant. The project required a certificate of appropriateness application which was approved by the Historic Preservation Commission.

Regarding biological resources, the Department reviewed biological assessments that were completed for past projects that share similar characteristics to the wheel. Based on substantial evidence, the department determined that the nighttime lighting of the wheel would have less than significant impacts on biological resources, including migratory and nesting birds.

That concludes my report and I am happy to take any questions. Thank you.

E. GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT

SPEAKERS: Georgia Schuttish – Mixed alterations in Noe Valley
Ozzie Rohm – Commissioners, we've been bringing up the need for an informational presentation on SB 330 and its implications on hearings relating to approval of development projects. The City needs to have a clear policy on what constitutes a continuance and what type of continuance will count towards the maximum of 5 that's been mandated by this legislation. Are continuances called by project sponsors or Planning counted and what types of projects qualify for SB 330 mandates? Are projects that filed for permits prior to when this law went into effect grandfathered when it comes to their continuances? We urge you to ask the Planning Department to work with the City Attorney's office to come up with a local

implementation of SB 330. Thanks, Ozzie Rohm for San Francisco Land Use Coalition

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.

12. [2021-000342CUA](#) (L. HOAGLAND: (628) 652-7320)
[403 28TH STREET](#) – south side of 28th Street; Lot 043 of Assessor's Block 6612 (District 8) – Request for **Conditional Use Authorization**, pursuant to Planning Code Sections 303 and 317 to document and legalize the tantamount to demolition of a three-story, 1,615 square foot, single-family residence and to permit the construction of a 2,602 square foot, four-bedroom, three and half bath home with a second floor rear deck and a two-car tandem garage. The height of the home will be increased to provide a code-compliant ceiling height on the third floor of the subject property. The project site is located 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: Approve with Conditions
 (Continued from Regular hearing on March 18, 2021)
Note: On March 18, 2021, after hearing and closing public comment, continued to April 1, 2021 with direction to add a second unit by a vote of +7 -0.

SPEAKERS: = Linda Ajello-Hoagland – Staff Report
 + Andy Rodgers – Project Sponsor Presentation
 - Ozzie Rohm – Involve DBI in review process
 - Georgia Schuttish – Demo calcs
 = Rich Hillis – Response to questions
 = Liz Watty – Response to questions

ACTION: Approved with Conditions
 AYES: Tanner, Chan, Diamond, Fung, Koppel
 NAYS: Imperial, Moore
 MOTION: [20884](#)

13. [2020-007565CUA](#) (C. MAY: (628) 652-7359)
[1336 CHESTNUT STREET](#) – north side between Van Ness Avenue and Franklin Street; Lot 005 in Assessor's Block 0479 (District 2) – Request for **Conditional Use Authorization**, pursuant to Planning Code Sections 209.1, 303 and 317, to permit the demolition of the existing 2,287 square-foot single-family dwelling and the construction of a new four-story, 8,686 square-foot, residential building containing four 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

SPEAKERS: = Chris May – Staff Report

- + Emerson Quan – Project Sponsor Presentation
- + Michael Hennessey – Architect presentation
- Speaker – Roof deck
- Speaker – Roof deck

ACTION: Approved with Conditions as amended such that the roof deck railing be pulled in three feet and the privacy planters placed outbound of the railing.

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

MOTION: [20885](#)

14. [2017-011827CUA](#) (K. DURANDET: (628) 652-7315)
26 HAMILTON STREET – west side of Hamilton Street between Silliman Street and Silver Avenue, Lot 003 of Assessor’s Block 5918 (District 9) – Request for **Conditional Use Authorization** pursuant to Planning Code Sections 303 and 317, to demolish a two-story, 1,219 square foot, single-family dwelling and to construct a new, code-complying, three-story, 3,926 square foot, single-family dwelling and an accessory dwelling unit 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: = Rich Sucre – Staff Report
 + Wing Lee – Project Sponsor Presentation

ACTION: Approved with Conditions

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

MOTION: [20886](#)

15. [2019-017356CUA](#) (C. FEENEY: (628) 652-7313)
1861 UNION STREET – south side of Union Street between Laguna and Octavia Streets, Lot 027 of Assessor’s Block 0543 (District 2) – Request for a **Conditional Use Authorization** pursuant to Planning Code Sections 202.2, 303, 303.1, and 725, to allow the establishment of a Formula Retail-Cannabis Retail use (d.b.a. MedMen). MedMen would occupy a vacant 3,061 square foot commercial space in a mixed-use building with residential units above within the Union Street NCD (Neighborhood Commercial District) 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 March 18, 2021)

SPEAKERS: = Claire Feeney – Staff Report
 + CJ Higley – Project Sponsor Presentation
 + Tracy McCourt – Project Sponsor Presentation
 + Malcolm Weitz – Project Sponsor Presentation
 + Jason – Support
 + Brian Goodwin – Support
 + Eric – Support
 + Alex – Support
 + John Heredia – Support
 + Rudy – Support
 - Devin Johnson – Opposed

- Speaker – Opposed
 + Nelson – Support
 - Shannon Getty – Opposed
 - Speaker – Opposed
 + Sarah – Support
 - Speaker – Opposed
 + Diane – Support
 - Speaker – Opposed
 + Jess Montejano – Project sponsor response to questions
 ACTION: Approved with Conditions
 AYES: Tanner, Chan, Diamond, Fung, Imperial, Moore, Koppel
 MOTION: [20887](#)

G. DISCRETIONARY REVIEW CALENDAR

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

16. [2019-015785DRP](#) (D. WINSLOW: (628) 652-7335)
2375 FUNSTON AVENUE – near Taraval Street; Lot 013 in Assessor’s Block 2342 (District 7) – Request for **Discretionary Review** of Building Permit No. 2019.0510.0311 for the construction of a two-story horizontal rear addition and a third-floor vertical addition with front and rear roof decks above existing second floor to an existing two-story single-family home within a RH-1(D) (Residential-House, One-Family- Detached) 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 with Modifications
 (Continued from Regular hearing on February 25, 2021)

SPEAKERS: = David Winslow – Staff Report Presentation
 - Michael Lane – DR Presentation
 + Kenny Yip – Project Sponsor Presentation
 - Speaker – Cut back on height and extension
 ACTION: Took DR, Approved with Staff modifications and conditioned no roof deck and transom windows on the north side.
 AYES: Tanner, Chan, Diamond, Fung, Imperial, Moore, Koppel
 DRA: [744](#)

ADJOURNMENT 4:00 PM
 ADOPTED APRIL 15, 2021