SAN FRANCISCO
PLANNING COMMISSION

Meeting Minutes
Remote Hearing
via video and teleconferencing

Thursday, April 29, 2021
1:00 p.m.
Regular Meeting

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

THE MEETING WAS CALLED TO ORDER BY PRESIDENT KOPPEL AT 1:02 PM

STAFF IN ATTENDANCE: Andrew Perry, Aaron Starr, Timothy Johnston, Xinyu Liang, Stephanie Cisneros, Elton Wu, Rich Sucre, Corey Teague – Zoning Administrator, 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.

1a. 2014.1058CUA
(E. JARDINES: (628) 652-7531)
6424 3RD STREET/188 KEY AVENUE – northeast intersection of 3rd Street and Key Avenue, Lot 002 of Assessor’s Block 5470 (District 10) – Request for Conditional Use Authorization, pursuant to Planning Code Sections 303 and 712 to demolish the existing one-story commercial building and allow new construction on a large lot (10,206-square-foot lot)
within a NC-3 (Neighborhood Commercial, Moderate Scale) 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
(Proposed for Continuance to May 13, 2021)

SPEAKERS: None
ACTION: Continued to May 13, 2021
AYES: Tanner, Chan, Diamond, Fung, Imperial, Moore, Koppel

1b. 2014.1058VAR
6424 3RD STREET/188 KEY AVENUE – northeast intersection of 3rd Street and Key Avenue, Lot 002 of Assessor’s Block 5470 (District 10) – Request for a Rear Yard Modification, pursuant to Planning Code Sections 134 and 305 to allow a reconfigured rear yard on a corner lot within a NC-3 (Neighborhood Commercial, Moderate Scale) Zoning District and 40-X Height and Bulk District.
(Proposed for Continuance to May 13, 2021)

SPEAKERS: None
ACTION: ZA Continued to May 13, 2021

2. 2019-019822DRP
4079 CESAR CHAVEZ STREET – between Noe and Sanchez Streets; Lot 029 in Assessor’s Block 6580 (District 8) – Request for Discretionary Review of Building Permit Application no. 2019.1010.4179 to construct a vertical addition and horizontal front and rear additions to an existing 2,227 square foot, two-story, two-family residence. The project also includes extensive remodeling of the interior and the front façade. The project would add 1,590 gross square feet to the existing building which will result in a 2,277 square foot unit and a 1,548 square foot unit with no on-site parking 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
(Continued from Regular hearing on April 15, 2021)
(Proposed for Continuance to May 20, 2021)

SPEAKERS: None
ACTION: Continued to May 20, 2021
AYES: Tanner, Chan, Diamond, Fung, Imperial, Moore, Koppel

3. 2016-012135CUA
2214 CAYUGA AVENUE AND 3101 ALEMANY BOULEVARD – between Sickles Avenue and Regent Street; Lots 001 and 034 in Assessor’s Block 7146 (District 11) – Request for a Conditional Use Authorization pursuant to Planning Code Sections 303, 317, and 710 for the demolition of an existing two-story, single family residence and the construction of four new four-story, 40-foot, residential buildings containing a total of seven dwelling units, approximately 15,196 square feet in area, and seven Class 1 bicycle parking spaces within a NC-1 (Neighborhood Commercial, Cluster) 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 February 25, 2021)

(Proposed for Indefinite Continuance)

SPEAKERS: None

ACTION: Continued Indefinitely

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

11. 2019-023105AHB

2800 GEARY BOULEVARD – northwest corner of Geary Boulevard and Wood Street, Lot 013 in Assessor’s Block 1069 (District 2) – Request for HOME-SF Authorization pursuant to Planning Code Sections 206.3 and 328 to construct a 65-foot tall, six-story mixed-use project with 42 dwelling units and a ground floor commercial use within the Geary Boulevard Neighborhood Commercial (NCD) Zoning District and 40-X Height and Bulk District. The HOME-SF program requires 30% of onsite dwelling units to be affordable units, with purchase prices ranging 80% of the Area Median Income (AMI) to 130% of AMI. The remaining 70% of dwelling units will not be subject to AMI restrictions. The HOME-SF program permits the project to exceed the prescribed height limit by up to 20 feet, which allows for the proposed fifth and sixth stories, and for form-based density. The project is also requesting modifications, pursuant to Planning Code Section 206.3(d)(4), of the rear yard and exposure requirements. The project is also subject to the Transportation Demand Management Program, pursuant to Planning Code Section 169. 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: Michael Coholan – Supports continuance

ACTION: Continued to June 17, 2021

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

12. 2018-011249CUA-02

1567 CALIFORNIA STREET – southeast corner at the intersection of California and Polk Streets; Lots 014, 014A and 015 in Assessor’s Block 0645 (District 3) – Request for a Waiver from Height (Section 260) pursuant to the Individually-Requested State Density Bonus Program to achieve a density bonus. On February 13, 2020, under Motion No. 20657, the Planning Commission granted a request for conditional use authorization, as well as four waivers and an incentive pursuant to the individually requested State Density Bonus Program to approve the proposed project at 1567 California Street. The approved Project would demolish the existing two-story commercial building and associated surface parking lot, and would construct an eight-story over-basement, approximately 80-foot tall mixed-use building including approximately 9,823 square feet of ground floor commercial space and 100 dwelling units. At the time of project approval, the Height and Bulk Map incorrectly identified approximately 22 parcels, including the subject property, as having a height limit of 80 feet. The correct height limit for these approximately 22 parcels, including the subject property, is 65 feet; therefore, an additional height waiver is required to allow the project to proceed. The design of the Project remains unchanged from the version previously
approved by the Planning Commission. No other changes are proposed to the Project or its prior approvals.

Preliminary Recommendation: Approve with Conditions
(Continued from Regular hearing on April 15, 2021)

SPEAKERS: Linda Chapman – Okay with continuance
Steve Vettel - Not okay with continuance
Andrew Perry – Response to questions

ACTION: Continued to May 13, 2021
AYES: Tanner, Chan, Diamond, Fung, Imperial, Moore, Koppel

16. **2013.0846DRP**

140-142 JASPER PLACE – between Union and Filbert Streets; Lot 032 in Assessor’s Block 0103 (District 3) – Request for Discretionary Review of Building Permit No. 2014.0627.9672 for the construction of a third-floor vertical addition set back 12 feet from front building wall, reconfigure the rear wall, and retrofit the basement level to expand the lower unit of an existing three-story, two-family house 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 March 4, 2021)

SPEAKERS: None
ACTION: Continued to May 6, 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. **2021-000485CUA**

3910 24TH STREET – north side of 24th Street between Sanchez and Noe streets; Lot 006 in Assessor’s Block 3654 (District 8) – Request for Conditional Use Authorization pursuant to Planning Code Sections 121.2, 303, and 728, to permit an approx. 3200 square foot use size and establish a Massage Use in an existing Personal Service Use (d.b.a. Cocoon Urban Day Spa) at the basement and first floor levels of the three-story, mixed use building within the 24th Street-Noe Valley 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

SPEAKERS: None
ACTION: Approved with Conditions
AYES: Tanner, Chan, Diamond, Fung, Imperial, Moore, Koppel
MOTION: 20899

5. 2021-000389DRP (D. WINSLOW: (628) 652-7335)  
366-368 COLLINGWOOD STREET – between 20th and 21st Streets; Lot 036 and 037 in Assessor’s Block 2751 (District 8) – Request for Discretionary Review of Building Permit Application no. 2020.1120.9381 to expand the roof decks at two upper units of the three-family home 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

SPEAKERS: None
ACTION: Took DR and Approved with Modifications
AYES: Tanner, Chan, Diamond, Fung, Imperial, Moore, Koppel
DRA: 748

C. COMMISSION MATTERS

6. Consideration of Adoption:
   • Draft Minutes for April 15, 2021

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

7. Commission Comments/Questions

Commissioner Diamond:
This is a request to Director Hillis. In recent months we've had a number of projects before us that have raised the question regarding the amount of open space that is provided with those projects. And it struck me that it might be useful instead of just looking at these projects on a case-by-case basis, to look at the overarching policies that are guiding some of our decisions as applied to these projects. Three issues in particular, struck me as warranting maybe some analysis and presentation to the Commission. There may be others, but the three that jumped out for me are as follows – 1) Why do we have different open space standards for Group Housing versus Residential? It seems like the standard for Group Housing is less the amount of open space per unit is less than it is for Residential. And I'm wondering what the rationale is for that distinction and if it still makes sense, especially in light of the very large group housing projects that we are seeing presented to us. Just on the face of it. The increased density of those projects makes me question why they have a lower open space standard than the standard residential projects. Secondly, I think, the added of Covid has shown us how important it is for residence and buildings to have the access to open space. A number of us have been asking questions about private balconies so that there is access for residence not only to have common open space but to have their own individualize open space. And we've been made aware that the current standards for balconies require that they be actually quite large in order to count as open space, and yet we've seen a desire on the part of some of the Commissioners including myself to encourage the addition of balconies that are at least large enough to accommodate one or two chairs so people can open the doors and just at least sit outside. And I'm wondering if we can take
a look at why it is that the standards discourage people from adding private balconies. It seems to me we ought to be doing just the opposite. So, I’m curious about that. And thirdly, and I’m not sure there is an answer to this but I'm worrying about it a lot, which is the ability to waive open space requirements for State Density bonus projects. The question is how low can that go. And that, is there a way for the City to look at its own regulations to at least preserve the argument that there is some bare minimum that needs to be provided? Because we’ve seen varying degrees of request for concessions on open space and as we look into the future I suspect, I guess we’re going to see a lot more State Density Bonus projects. I’m not suggesting that if we look at these issues and decide that changes are warranted that we would necessarily apply those changes to projects that are very far long in the process. But I do think it’s useful if you agree to step back and take a look at the policy issues behind open space and see if any changes might be warranted. Or, at least for those of us newer on the Commission, to understand why the rules are the way they are right now.

Rich Hillis, Planning Director:
I think we can schedule a discussion because we recognize this issue has come up on various projects by various Commissioners. And so, happy to schedule an Informational Item in the next couple of months to talk about it.

Commissioner Diamond:
Thank you. That would be much appreciated.

Commissioner Tanner:
I was just nodding along with everything that Commissioner Diamond was saying. So, I do look forward to that discussion. I wanted to just celebrate a little bit that, I believe yesterday I think the City and County was at 69% so hopefully today we’re at 70% of residents who have their first vaccination, at least one vaccination shot. I’m so proud of our city. I’m so proud to live here during the pandemic and I know we have so much heartache and so much pain that has happened. But I am just so proud of us for being able to get vaccinated and just encourage anyone who hasn’t yet been able to to consider doing that. Call your friends and family who may be in other states and encourage them also to get vaccinated so we can hopefully get back to something that looks like fully open California, whatever that looks like. I’m really really really thrilled and looking forward to a good summer. And then I also wanted to just comment and thank Michael Christensen, who a few weeks ago, authored a report for us on Cannabis in San Francisco. So, the report did get read and I really appreciated the analysis that you provided of where things are and kind of the status of the Cannabis dispensaries in San Francisco, so thank you.

D. DEPARTMENT MATTERS

8. Director’s Announcements

Rich Hillis, Planning Director:
Thank you, Jonas. Good afternoon, Commissioners. I just wanted to take a moment during this meeting to recognize, celebrate, and thank Delvin Washington who is joining us today. Who is actually retiring this week. He’s retiring tomorrow after 24 years of service with the department. Delvin joined in 1997 which may not seem like a long time, but if you look at the issues of the day, I think we were deferring blockbusters in the proliferation of video stores then so a lot has happened. He soon became team leader and had been leading the
Southeast quadrant in the department for many years. And many of you know Delvin from his many hours spent here on the Commission. That's where I got to know him initially as a Commissioner. I can say it was great to see a case that Delvin was managing because you could expect things to go smoothly. He's smart, [inaudible]. He's a problem solver. But personality-wise too, he made the room brighter. He made the meetings brighter. He's always positive. He's calm, he's cool. He has an infectious laugh and smile and he's the same way in the office. He's been a great manager and a great mentor to new planners and he's mentored extraordinary planners over the years in the department. And so, his personality is going to be missed tremendously in the office and we wish him all the best in retirement. He's not leaving the Bay Area. He was born and raised in Oakland, where it sounds like he's going to stay. He has raised two sons, Nile and Chad. His wife is joining us today of 30 years, Lan. He told me in retirement, he's going to ramp up his community-based work and advocate also to keep the A's in Oakland, which I'm supportive of. So, we wish him all the best and really thank him for his service to the city, in the department, and I want to turn the floor over to Delvin.

Delvin Washington:
Thank you, Rich. Yes, it's been an honor working this last 24 years with San Francisco Planning. There's been a lot of growth in the Department. Obviously, we've doubled in size since I first got here. The things I could say is it's an excellent group of people. I can see just the fact that we have a former staff member that's on the Planning Commission and a former Planning Commissioner that's on staff. But I have a lot of respect and pride in the department. It's not perfect but we always, we are making moves to make it a more inclusive department. We're striving to just make ourselves make it better and I'm very proud of it. No, it's been an honor working with San Francisco. I was just a little skinny kid growing up in East Oakland, but I just always felt if you keep a good attitude on what you're trying to do, you can reach your goals. The things I learned from the department and just how to solve problems and those are the things that I've looked on for the people that I've been able to bring to the Department's family. I'm really proud of the staff I've been able to hire and gone on to have a lot of good work with the city. I have nothing but joy and honor and pride that I was able to work with this organization. I wish you the best. And you haven't heard the last, I am going to still keep in touch with the department and be somewhat a visible face a little less visible. This is my wife, Lan, and she actually, ironically, she started the same year I started. She had left a private practice to join Kaiser Permanente. She since then, actually beat me a year in advance in retirement. And she's been actually doing volunteer inoculations [inaudible]. That was one of the things she started after retirement [inaudible]. It's been beautiful and I've really enjoyed working with the department and with the City. Again, thank you. It's been great.

Lan Washington:
I will just say, Rich, thanks for your very kind words. And Delvin is very calm and cool under pressure and you know very thoughtful in what he does at work and at home. Completely different from his wife. So, except he's not a planner at home.

Delvin Washington:
Well she does all the planning.
Lan Washington:
That’s not a surprise. He’s enjoyed it. Really, really been a great career for him at the City and he’s very proud of who he’s hired and who he works with. And you know his late nights at the Commission have not been unlike my late nights on call. So I just wanted to just thank globally the department for giving him that opportunity to do such good work at the longest city that he stayed with. And that says a lot, since he worked in a lot of the cities in the Bay Area.

Delvin Washington:
I’ve actually almost circled the bay.

President Koppel:
I want to start by saying, again, thanks for everything, Delvin. First of all, I’m extremely jealous. So, enjoy your free time from here on out. This is something I wish we could really do in person, you know, just to shake your hand and what not. I think the last time we saw each other face-to-face was ex Director Rahaim’s retirement party at the top of the Salesforce Tower. At least I have that memory with you. Best wishes.

Commissioner Moore:
I had the pleasure of working face-to-face with Delvin over the years, not just in the chambers, but also at the Planning Department because there were times when we had meetings that required us to be present. The one thing Delvin always did is he very much camouflaged his age. He does not look like retirement and he never did even then. And while he had all the seniority leading staff and we’re doing great projects, and we worked very hard on quite a few of them Delvin, as you recall. He always fooled me thinking he was probably 20 years younger and 20 years before retirement. And that he seems to look the same from here even in the virtual world. For all of my fellow Commissioners who did not have the pleasure of really meeting you three-dimensionally, he is a wonderful person and I will greatly miss you. All the best and enjoy that time off. And you are lucky that your wife is retired too. Once all this Covid restrictions disappear, the world is yours. All the best. Thank you.

Delvin Washington:
Thank you.

Commissioner Tanner:
Delvin, it’s just really great to at least virtually see you. And you know not actually worked with you but worked alongside you and kind of seen your leadership in the department while I was there as a staff. And I just can’t agree more with everything everyone said and so happy for you. Sad for the department but I know you’re also the type of manager who really develops the people who are on your team. And so, while there is definitely no way to fill your shoes and the gap of who you are in the department. I’m sure you have left the team well equipped to rise to the occasion. And so, I’m just really excited for you and so proud that I got to even work alongside you for a very little bit of time. And maybe one of the things you can do on your retirement is that teach more public servants how to remain cool and calm under pressure. Some best practices on how to do that. You can send me some tips if you have them.
Delvin Washington:
I’ll do that.

Commissioner Diamond:
As someone who used to represent applicants in front of the Commission and I have worked with the department in that capacity, I wanted to let you know that I always felt a sense of relief when you were brought in to a matter because that meant that we would get your unique blend of pragmatism and wisdom. Looking at the particular issues that were represented and I so appreciated that. I just wanted to wish you the best of luck in your next phase.

Delvin Washington:
Thank you.

Jonas P. Ionin, Commission Secretary:
I’ll just say, congratulations Delvin. Lan, he’s all yours.

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

Aaron Starr, Manager of Legislative Affairs:
Good afternoon Commissioner’s, Aaron Starr Manager of Legislative Affairs A quick report today.


At Land Use this weekend, the Committee heard the Landmark Designation for the Lyon-Martin House located at 651 Duncan. The Lyon-Martin House is eligible for Landmark status because it is associated with persons and events that have made a significant contribution to San Francisco history. Specifically, Designation of Lyon-Martin House is associated with the history of Development of Homophile organizations in San Francisco, specifically the Daughters of Bilitis, the first Lesbian-Rights organization in the United States, and as the longtime home of pioneering Lesbian-Rights activists, Phyllis Lyon and Del Martin.

The HPC heard this item on February 17, 2021 and recommended approval.

At the hearing staff and member of the LGBT Historical society presented the Landmark to the Committee and answered question. There were three members of the public spoke in favor of the landmarking and none that spoke against it. The item was then forwarded to the Full Board with Recommendation.


And at the Full Board this week, The Supervisors passed a Resolution initiating the Landmark Designation for the Diego Rivera Mural “The Allegory of California”, sponsored by Supervisor Peskin. This resolution just starts the landmarking process, it still needs to be reviewed by the HPC and approve by ordinance.
E. GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT

SPEAKERS: Sue Hestor – Planning is not following its own Rules & Regulations on submissions of staff reports AND time limits for public testimony.
Commission RULES require that staff packets are due one week in advance of hearing. THURSDAY before p.m. Today they are only available when Agenda comes out late Friday afternoon. Too late for public to read and submit comments to Commissioners.
Public testimony is also truncated. Rules provide for 3 minutes for individual comments. When there has already been one hearing, Rules provide that President may exercise discretion. Usually done for second hearing on project. Recently ONE MINUTE time limit imposed on FIRST hearing on 468 Turk project.
Remote hearings are difficult on everyone. Commissioners. The public. What should be 3-hour meeting, becomes 5 hours. Speakers often hard to hear. Difficult to present visuals.
Please calendar for discussion returning to City Hall for Commission meetings.
Georgia Schuttish – Demo calc and alterations
Linda Chapman – Maps, height

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, expediters, and/or other advisors.

10. 2016-016100ENV (T. JOHNSTON: (628) 652-7569)
SFPUC SOUTHERN SKYLINE BOULEVARD RIDGE TRAIL EXTENSION PROJECT – Certification of the Final Environmental Impact Report (EIR). The project area includes watershed lands along the Fifield-Cahill ridge trail, which is approximately one and a half miles north of the State Route 92 (S.R. 92)/State Route 35 (S.R. 35) intersection (north of the Skylawn Memorial Park), and watershed lands extending south from S.R. 92 approximately six miles to the Phleger Estate boundary and east from S.R. 35 a few hundred feet. The proposed project seeks to improve and develop recreational trails and associated facilities located within the Peninsula Watershed in central San Mateo County. The Peninsula Watershed property is owned by the City and County of San Francisco and managed by the SFPUC. The project is a component of the SFPUC’s Peninsula Watershed Management Plan.
Note: The public hearing on the Draft EIR is closed. The public comment period for the Draft EIR ended on August 10, 2020. Public comment will be received when the item is called during the hearing. However, comments submitted may not be included in the Final EIR.
Preliminary Recommendation: Certify

SPEAKERS: = Tim Johnston – Staff presentation
+ Liz Westbrook – Supports certification
+ Denise – Significant value to quality of life

ACTION: Certified
AYES: Tanner, Chan, Diamond, Fung, Imperial, Moore, Koppel
MOTION: 20900

13a. 2020-005255SHD_2020-006576SHD  
474 BRYANT STREET AND 77 STILLMAN STREET – between 2nd Street and 3rd Street; Lots 016 and 017 in Assessor’s Block 3763 (District 6) – Request for Planning Commission consideration of Adoption of Shadow Findings pursuant to Section 295 that shadows from the project would not adversely affect the use of South Park under the jurisdiction of the Recreation and Park Commission. The project site is located within the CMUO (Central SoMa Mixed Use Office) Zoning District, Central SoMa Special Use District, and 85-X Height and Bulk District.

Preliminary Recommendation: Adopt

SPEAKERS: = Xinyu Liang – Staff presentation  
+ John Kevlin – Project sponsor  
+ Lucille Inocencio – Design presentation

ACTION: Adopted Findings
AYES: Tanner, Chan, Diamond, Fung, Imperial, Moore, Koppel
MOTION: 20901

13b. 2020-005255ENX  
474 BRYANT STREET – north side of Bryant Street between 2nd Street and 3rd Street; Lots 016 and 017 in Assessor’s Block 3763 (District 6) – Request for Large Project Authorization (LPA) pursuant to Planning Code Section 329 with modifications to Planning Code Section 155(r) for a curb cut on Bryant Street for the project that would demolish two vacant PDR buildings, adjust the existing lot lines, and construct a new seven-story-over-basement, 85-foot tall mixed-use office building (approximately 61,827 square feet) with approximately 8,566 square feet of Light Manufacturing use on the ground floor and six parking and loading spaces for PDR tenants in the basement garage, within the CMUO (Central SoMa Mixed Use Office) Zoning District, Central SoMa Special Use District, and 85-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: Same as item 13a.

ACTION: Approved with Conditions
AYES: Tanner, Chan, Diamond, Fung, Imperial, Moore, Koppel
MOTION: 20902

13c. 2020-005255OFA  
474 BRYANT STREET – north side of Bryant Street between 2nd Street and 3rd Street; Lots 016 and 017 in Assessor’s Block 3763 (District 6) – Request for Office Development Authorization pursuant to Planning Code Sections 321 and 322 to authorize up to 49,999 square feet from the Office Development Annual Limit. The project site is located within the CMUO (Central SoMa Mixed Use Office) Zoning District, Central SoMa Special Use District, and 85-X Height and Bulk District.

Preliminary Recommendation: Approve with Conditions
SPEAKERS: Same as item 13a.
ACTION: Approved with Conditions
AYES: Tanner, Chan, Diamond, Fung, Imperial, Moore, Koppel
MOTION: 20903

13d. **2020-006576ENX**

77 STILLMAN STREET – south side of Stillman Street between 2nd Street and 3rd Street; Lots 016 and 017 in Assessor’s Block 3763 (District 6) – Request for **Large Project Authorization** (LPA) pursuant to Planning Code Section 329 for the project that would demolish two vacant PDR buildings, adjust the existing lot lines, and construct a new seven-story-over-basement, 85-foot tall mixed-use office building (approximately 61,662 square feet) with approximately 8,566 square feet of Light Manufacturing use on the ground floor and 14 off-street parking spaces for office tenants and six parking and loading spaces for PDR tenants in the basement garage, within the CMUO (Central SoMa Mixed Use Office) Zoning District, Central SoMa Special Use District, and an 85-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: Same as item 13a.
ACTION: Approved with Conditions
AYES: Tanner, Chan, Diamond, Fung, Imperial, Moore, Koppel
MOTION: 20904

13e. **2020-006576OFA**

77 STILLMAN STREET – south side of Stillman Street between 2nd Street and 3rd Street; Lots 016 and 017 in Assessor’s Block 3763 (District 6) – Request for **Office Development Authorization** pursuant to Planning Code Sections 321 and 322 to authorize up to 49,834 square feet from the Office Development Annual Limit. The project site is located within the CMUO (Central SoMa Mixed Use Office) Zoning District, Central SoMa Special Use District, and an 85-X Height and Bulk District.

Preliminary Recommendation: Approve with Conditions

SPEAKERS: Same as item 13a.
ACTION: Approved with Conditions
AYES: Tanner, Chan, Diamond, Fung, Imperial, Moore, Koppel
MOTION: 20905

14a. **2020-006045CUA**

292 EUREKA STREET – west side of Eureka Street at the corner of 20th Street; Lot 020 in Assessor’s Block 2699 (District 8) – Request for **Conditional Use Authorization** pursuant to Planning Code Sections 303 and 317, to legalize a tantamount to demolition of an existing two-story-over-basement, single-family residence. The proposal includes the addition of a new dwelling unit at the ground floor of the existing single-family residence 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
SPEAKERS: = Stephanie Cisneros – Staff report
+ Toby Morris – Project sponsor
= Georgia Schuttish – Demo calcs
ACTION: Approved with Conditions
AYES: Tanner, Chan, Diamond, Fung, Imperial, Moore, Koppel
MOTION: 20906

14b. 2020-006045VAR
292 EUREKA STREET – west side of Eureka Street at the corner of 20th Street; Lot 020 in Assessor’s Block 2699 (District 8) – Request for a Variance from Planning Code Sections 132 (front setback), 134 (rear yard), and 135 open space) requirements to legalize rear and front alterations to an existing two-story-over-basement, single-family residence. The proposal includes the addition of a new dwelling unit at the ground floor of the existing single-family residence located within a RH-2 (Residential – House, Two Family) Zoning District and 40-X Height and Bulk District.

SPEAKERS: Same as item 14a.
ACTION: After hearing and closing public comment; ZA indicated an intent to Grant

15. 2020-009424CUA
231-235 WILDE AVENUE – south side of Wilde Avenue between Goettingen and Brussels Streets, Lot 033 of Assessor’s Block 6198 (District 10) – Request for Conditional Use Authorization, pursuant to Planning Code Sections 209.1, 303 and 317 to demolish an existing single-family dwelling unit, subdivide the existing 50 foot wide lot into two 25 foot wide lots and to construct two single-family dwelling units (one on each new lot) within a RH-1 (Residential-House, One Family) Zoning District and 40-X Height and Bulk Districts. 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 Hillis - Introduction
= Elton Wu – Staff presentation
+ Peter Wilson – Project sponsors
- Stacey Young – Removes view and natural light and reduces parking
ACTION: Approved with Conditions
AYES: Tanner, Chan, Diamond, Fung, Imperial, Moore, Koppel
MOTION: 20907

ADJOURNMENT 2:53 PM
ADOPTED MAY 13, 2021