

SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING COMMISSION



Meeting Minutes Remote Hearing via video and teleconferencing

**Thursday, May 13, 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 1:03 PM

STAFF IN ATTENDANCE: Aaron Starr, Gabriela Pantoja, Audrey Merlone, Veronica Flores, Mat Snyder, Andrew Perry, Claire Feeney, Esmeralda Jardines, Michael Christensen, Rich Sucre, Scott Sanchez, 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.

1. 2021-000603CUA (M. CHRISTENSEN: (628) 652-7567)
5 LELAND AVENUE – located on the west side of the intersection of Leland Avenue and Bay Shore Blvd; Lot 001 in Assessor's Block 6249 (District 10) – Request for **Conditional Use Authorization**, pursuant to Planning Code Sections 202.2, 303, and 712, to establish a new,

2,200 square foot Cannabis Retail use on the ground floor of the existing mixed-use building. The Project does not include a request for an on-site smoking or vaporizing lounge. The Project Site is located within a NC-3 (Neighborhood Commercial, Moderate) 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
(Proposed for Continuance to May 27, 2021)

SPEAKERS: Speaker – Agree with continuance
 ACTION: Continued to May 27, 2021
 AYES: Tanner, Chan, Diamond, Fung, Imperial, Moore, Koppel

2. [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 **Conditional Use Authorization**, pursuant to Planning Code 303 and 317 to demolish an existing three-story single-family dwelling with an unauthorized dwelling unit 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 4,378 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 April 15, 2021)

Note: On March 4, 2021, after hearing and closing public comment, continued to April 1, 2021 by a vote of +7 -0. On April 1, 2021, without hearing, continued to April 15, 2021 by a vote of +7 -0. On April 15, 2021, without hearing, continued to May 13, 2021 by a vote of +7 -0.

(Proposed for Continuance to June 3, 2021)

SPEAKERS: None
 ACTION: Continued to June 3, 2021
 AYES: Tanner, Chan, Diamond, Fung, Imperial, Moore, Koppel

17. [2019-019373DRP](#) (D. WINSLOW: (628) 652-7335)
217 HUGO STREET – between 3rd and 4th Avenues; Lot 024 in Assessor's Block 1752 (District 5) – Request for **Discretionary Review** of Building Permit Application nos. 2019.0730.7350 and 2019.0730.7351 to demolish an existing one-story commercial building and construct a three-story over-garage building with two dwelling units 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: Speaker – Who is requesting continuance
 ACTION: Continued to May 20, 2021
 AYES: Tanner, Chan, Diamond, Fung, Imperial, Moore, Koppel

18. [2020-007734DRP-03](#) (D. WINSLOW: (628) 652-7335)
3441 WASHINGTON STREET – between Walnut and Laurel Streets; Lot 027 in Assessor's Block 0996 (District 2) – Request for **Discretionary Review** of Building Permit Application no. 2020.0807.1354 to construct a new two-story horizontal addition to the east side of the existing two-story over-basement single-family house and a new one-story vertical addition with roof terrace within a RH-1 (Residential House, One-Family) Zoning District and 40-X Height and Bulk District. The existing building is approximately 4,841 square feet in size and with the proposed project the building would be approximately 8,575 square feet in size. 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

SPEAKERS: None
 ACTION: Continued to May 27, 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

3. [2020-008474CUA](#) (S. YOUNG: (628) 652-7349)
3519 CALIFORNIA STREET – south side between Laurel and Spruce Streets; Lots 001 in Assessor's Block 1035 (District 2) – Request for **Conditional Use Authorization** pursuant to Planning Code Sections 303, 303.1, and 713 to establish a Formula Retail Use within a NC-S (Neighborhood Commercial Shopping Center) District and 40-X Height and Bulk District. The project is to convert a vacant ground floor commercial space with approximately 1,141 square feet of floor area (previously occupied by a limited restaurant formula retail use d.b.a. Noah's New York Bagels) to another limited restaurant formula retail use d.b.a. Panda Express. The project will involve storefront and tenant improvements to the ground floor commercial tenant space which is located within the Laurel Village Shopping Center. There is no expansion of the existing building envelope 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
 (Continued from Regular hearing on April 15, 2021)

SPEAKERS: None
 ACTION: Approved with Conditions
 AYES: Tanner, Chan, Diamond, Fung, Imperial, Moore, Koppel
 MOTION: [20914](#)

4. [2019-021247CUA](#) (N. FOSTER: (628) 652-7330)
1537 MISSION STREET – south side of Mission Street between 11th Street and Lafayette Street; Lot 082 in Assessor's Block 3511 (District 6) – Request for **Conditional Use Authorization**, pursuant to Planning Code Sections 156(f) and 303, to permit a five-year

extension of an existing, temporary Public Parking Lot. The Project Site is located within a C-3-G (Downtown-General) Zoning District, 85-X Height and Bulk District, and Van Ness and Market Residential Special Use 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: [20915](#)

C. COMMISSION MATTERS

5. Consideration of Adoption:
- [Draft Minutes for April 29, 2021](#)

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

6. Commission Comments/Questions

None.

7. [O Guttenburg Street](#)

Jonas P. Ionin, Commission Secretary:

Commissioners, last week you had requested that we add this item on today's agenda to allow you to discuss the Conditions of Approval that you had added, related to the landscaping. And I believe the project sponsor has responded with updated plans that may reflect what you had originally intended. We don't have a presentation from staff, we don't have a presentation from the sponsor. It's on here just for you all to be allowed to discuss.

Commissioner Moore:

I saw two letters in a day from Mr. Gladstone. And the second letter which came in yesterday afternoon made further corrections to not using just grass but expanding into other permeable surfaces. And I am comfortable with that response and I appreciate the Department for buckling down and really helping to formulate choice of alternatives here, because it is not just about grass it, is more about permeability and natural surfaces. So, I thank you to staff. And from my perspective this project has my support.

Commissioner Fung:

Question for staff. During the discussion on the landscape being, and the driveway etcetera, a point was brought up regarding a permeable driveway, something similar to turf block or something like that. I saw no response, both in terms of the landscape plan and comments made by project sponsor. Was that discussed at all?

Gabriella Pantoja:

Hello. Gabriella Pantoja here, Department staff. So, there was a discussion about it. And I don't know if we have the project sponsor on the line, Jonas, to kind of respond to that. There is permeability that was added between buildings A – or buildings B and C. And then the driveways for buildings A also includes it. So, the only kind of section that does not include the permeable surface is that main roadway that goes from Guttenberg into the development. I think there was concerns there about what runs below the driveway there in terms of [inaudible] and also for water management.

Commissioner Fung:

What do you mean by “what runs below it”?

Gabriella Pantoja:

So, the utilities. All that kind of thing.

Commissioner Fung:

Okay. I was more concerned about that driveway than the other driveways because of the noise factor to adjoining homes. You have all these new homes with garages and cars driving past to homes that one normally doesn't expect.

Jonas P. Ionin, Commission Secretary:

Commissioner Fung, did you want the project sponsor to respond? He is online.

Commissioner Fung:

Yes, that's fine.

Brett Gladstone, Project Sponsor:

Good afternoon, Commissioners. Can you hear me? This is Brett Gladstone.

Jonas P. Ionin, Commission Secretary:

Yes, we can hear you.

Brett Gladstone, Project Sponsor:

Thank you. I'm going to ask Bruce Chan, the landscaper, or Brad who is on the architectural team to respond. Brad, would you like to respond or would you like the landscape architect, Bruce Chan, to respond? Go ahead Brad.

Brad:

Hi Brett. I believe that Bruce is better qualified to speak to the permeability issue. I do believe this was all discussed at the last hearing and there were some concerns that was mentioned about the utilities that exist below the driveway. But Bruce, can you explain the permeability [inaudible] provided in the front yards of the building in the unit of building A and the driveway between buildings B & C please.

Bruce Chan, Landscape Architect:

Yes, we are using a –

Brett Gladstone, Project Sponsor:

Please introduce yourself.

Bruce Chan, Landscape Architect:

Yes. Excuse me. I'm sorry. This is Bruce Chan, Landscape Architect. And, in regards to the the pavement materials in the front yards per both the driveways and walkways they are unit pavers set on a compacted gravel base. Gravel base is also permeable even though it is substantial enough to hold the weight of a vehicle. But it does have high permeability.

Commissioner Fung:

Somewhat permeability. But the -- what about the noise factor to the two homes that get passed daily by multiple cars?

Bruce Chan, Landscape Architect:

Well, the noise factor coming from pavers is somewhat less than that of concrete. Because concrete is a smoother surface. The pavers because of the porousness is actually more, if you can imagine that in a section, it is sort of like -- and forgive me if I get too technical, there is many small spaces there, there's air. And so what that does is when a tire goes over it and studies have shown that that air dissipates the sound as opposed to a smooth surface that reflects the sound.

Commissioner Fung:

Not sure I accept that.

Brad:

So if I may, this is Brad again --

Bruce Chan, Landscape Architect:

A good example is -- sure.

Brad:

Are you there? Can you hear me?

Brett Gladstone, Project Sponsor:

Yes.

Brad:

Brett, I believe that Commissioner Fung is asking. Commissioner Fung, would you please confirm that your concern is about the immediate access off of Guttenberg between the two existing homes and the condition of the porous surface that you would like to see there?

Commissioner Fung:

That's correct.

Brad:

Or between buildings B & C okay. Bruce, do you understand? With that being, what would perhaps proposing is the concern if we could have porous material between those buildings at the entry of the driveway to the development.

Bruce Chan, Landscape Architect:

Yes that would be that- the neck if you will. So, Commissioner Fung, your specific question is the noise that comes from permeable pavers versus that of asphalt. Is that what you're asking?

Commissioner Fung:

It's not necessary a question. It was, I believe, a statement I made that the permeable product such as turf block would provide less of a sound impact than asphalt paving.

Bruce Chan, Landscape Architect:

That is correct. Turf block would be less because you would have living materials growing and that would cushion the sound much more than a hard surface. If the requirement is to, or you wish to see a turf block, that can certainly be engineered for a 50,000 pound capacity so that emergency vehicles could come across that material. So it is possible.

Commissioner Fung:

I don't know if other Commissioners share that concern.

Commissioner Diamond:

I had asked to speak not regarding Commissioner Fung's concerns so I am not going to address that. Other Commissioners may want to. But I wanted to say that I had raised a similar concern to Commissioner Moore when this came in front of us. I think it is really well designed, much needed complex. And I was concerned about the quality of the landscaping not being on par with the rest of the project. And I particularly was not in favor of synthetic turf. I believe that the information in the first letter yesterday was quite concerning to me because I wasn't arguing for natural sod in lieu of synthetic turf. I just thought we should have the natural drought tolerant material, but I believe the second letter allows for that. And so, I am fine with the language of the second letter yesterday.

Commissioner Moore:

I find Commissioner Fung's question actually very important. Since these houses are built quite closely together. I think the acceleration of noise could be potentially a problem. I also believe that aesthetically, which is not necessarily always a weighing factor, that entering into basically what is a small community on its own could make a design statement, which I think would have multiple benefits. Most and foremost in support of concerns about noise and reflection of noise.

Commissioner Tanner:

I wanted to just pick up on Commissioner Fung's line of questioning and topic. I certainly support increased permeability to the extent that it's feasible. So I think what I -- maybe the project sponsor can help eliminate. It was just said that it could be engineered to be pavers there in that section. Because I understand the "L" section between buildings B and C is already somewhat permeable which I think is fine. And so, it sounds like there was a conversation about it. It sounded like the planner was saying that it was considered but due to what was below it, it wouldn't be feasible. So, I guess the question I have is, is it feasible for the project, for that section to have more permeability, or is it not feasible for that section of the roadway. And I don't know if the folks who were sharing could speak to that.

Bruce Chan, Landscape Architect:

This is Bruce Chan, the landscape architect. Yes, it can be engineered, again to provide for the weight of emergency vehicles as well as protecting infrastructure piping that's below it.

Commissioner Tanner:

Okay. So, you think that could happen. So, I would be open to the will of the Commission in terms of -- and I guess the second question, is that feasible for the project to support that type of, I don't know if its great expense or revision but -- If it is feasible, it is great. How does the project feel about doing that? And back to the Commissioners of what you would like to see?

Brett Gladstone, Project Sponsor:

I am going to actually ask the project sponsor, owner of the property, Mr. Jayesh Patel, to speak. But before he does, could I ask Bruce Chan to state for us what the incremental expense might be? Then I will let Mr. Patel very briefly tell us all whether he can accept that.

Bruce Chan, Landscape Architect:

Certainly. The installation of curb stone suitable for requirements that fire and emergency would have per square foot I would say it is roughly 2.5 times the cost of asphalt. And it would be roughly two times the cost of unit pavers.

Brett Gladstone, Project Sponsor:

For a square footage of how much, Mr. Chan?

Bruce Chan, Landscape Architect:

With the length of approximately 120 feet by 24 feet-hold on doing some quick math here. That is about 2,800 square feet? I was going to take a stab what the current cost of asphalt is for a roadway. I would imagine with underlayment base cost, the asphalt for that would be in the neighborhood of probably 80 to \$100,000.

Brett Gladstone, Project Sponsor:

For the incremental at base?

Bruce Chan, Landscape Architect:

So, to make it turf stone, you would be looking at 2.5 times that cost because of the base preparation being higher. And you need to irrigate that curb stone as well because of the living material. So, it would be \$250,000 as opposed to \$100,000.

Brett Gladstone, Project Sponsor:

That is the incremental amount, Mr. Chan?

Bruce Chan, Landscape Architect:

Yes.

Commissioner Fung:

Mr. Chan, you are saying that asphalt is running somewhere over \$4 per square foot and therefore, the turf block is running somewhere around \$10?

Bruce Chan, Landscape Architect:

Correct.

Commissioner Tanner:

Thank you for that. Mr. Gladstone did Mr. Patel want to speak to --

Brett Gladstone, Project Sponsor:

Yes. Mr. Patel, if you understand Mr. Chan go ahead and speak to whether that is acceptable to you. If you don't understand Mr. Chan you can ask him another question. Go ahead, please.

Mr. Patel, Property Owner:

I will try to explain what I understood so far from the architect and from all the [inaudible] and the cost. Currently this project is very barely viable because the land is taking for the approval and the construction cost included. And if there is added cost, If there is more costs getting added then it becomes very difficult to have this project really built. So, any little cost is a big burden for the project. And the main thing of the road will become higher and higher if the pavers are used. And if you take a look, actually there are some, I am not sure what you call it. There is subsurface water treatment happening on the deeper part of the same roadway towards where the turn is. So, we do take care of the water treatment there under the surface. But we will really appreciate if we can do asphalt versus the pavers because of those added costs. [inaudible]

Brett Gladstone, Project Sponsor:

I'll say one last thing. I also want to remind Commissioners that once the developer sells these it is the homeowners association here. And they are probably first time home buyers because these are, you know, small and affordable by design but it is the homeowners association ultimately responsible over the future years to repair pavers and alike. Sort of uh, yeah anyway. Thank you, Commissioners.

Commissioner Tanner:

Thank you. I would just say, Commissioners, I would say I am a little bit in the middle on this. I am sympathetic to the cost to the project but also the cost to future homeowners who will have to maintain it. And then I am kind of torn between that and wanting something that moves us to the direction of sustainability which is I think just globally where we need to go. And when rain falls in the city and in the state, we need to catch it and make sure it can percolate down and help to recharge our water systems. With that said, this is one driveway, roadway. a very small area. And so, is that really going to be something that makes this whole city more sustainable? Not in of itself. I would say, I'm kind of in the middle, I do support the other landscaping that was submitted and find that satisfactory in terms of the planting materials for the rest of the project.

Jonas P. Ionin, Commission Secretary:

Thank you, Commissioners. This is a nonaction item. Unless you wanted to bring this back for some sort of an action.

Commissioner Fung:

It's still my recommendation that they go to a softer permeable surface on that driveway.

Commissioner Moore:

I am in support of the softer permeable surfaces myself.

Jonas P. Ionin, Commission Secretary:

Again, at this point, Commissioners, today I guess we could make that request and recommendation to the project sponsor. But to amend the Conditions of Approval we would have to reschedule the project for a full hearing before you. Project sponsor would you be amenable to considering more softer, more permeable surface?

Brett Gladstone, Project Sponsor:

I will let Mr. Patel respond.

Mr. Patel, Property Owner:

Can you please repeat? Are we okay if we do the permeable but we are not okay if we do the asphalt?

Commissioner Tanner:

Yeah, I think that was the question. Was whether or not just through this conversation you can consider a more permeable surface, maybe another compromise could be, because I am less concerned about the sound, I know that is Commissioner Fung's concern. But just ways to ensure the stormwater that does fall can be recharged whether that is a bioswale or just how the water can recharge and can percolate. That is my main concern. And that may not be the permeable surface. Perhaps it's just how the stormwater is managed. Perhaps that is already accounted for in the stormwater management plan but that may be a compromise. Perhaps lower cost than a totally different surface. So, I guess two questions, 1) are you open to a different surface, and then 2) maybe the stormwater can get managed in a different way, besides the surface alone.

Mr. Patel, Property Owner:

Yes. So, we are okay with the alternatives that you guys provide.

Bruce Chan, Landscape Architect:

if I may interject something. This is Bruce Chan, Landscape architect. In calculating the water usage for the landscape design with the live lawn material we are very close to the limit of how much water we can apply to this project, supplementally. If we were to have a permeable surface, i.e. the turf block with live turf that would have to be irrigated as a regular lawn. And my sense is that the project would then not comply with state legal requirements. So it would be unit pavers[inaudible] the alternative.

Commissioner Tanner:

That's helpful to know. Okay, thank you for that.

Bruce Chan, Landscape Architect:

Certainly.

Jonas P. Ionin, Commission Secretary:

So, Commissioners are we satisfied here or --

Commissioner Tanner:

I am.

Commissioner Fung:

I am okay.

Commissioner Moore:

I am okay.

D. DEPARTMENT MATTERS**8. Director's Announcements****Rich Hillis, Planning Director:**

Good afternoon, Commissioners. Speaking of soft and permeable surfaces, I just wanted to let you know that City Hall -- you probably got a press release from the Mayor's Office. The board sent one also that City Hall is going to reopen or start to gradually reopen beginning June 7th with public access and in-person services, like for the Assessor or Tax Collector. The board is also going to start meeting in person beginning June 5th but only for the staff, not the public. So, I know this will be a question that comes up but we don't have any direction yet on when the Commission can start meeting again back in City Hall but we will keep you informed. And then also I wanted to let you know that we did expand in person services at the Permit Center on Monday, as I mentioned last week and that is all going smoothly with good public feedback.

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 Commissioners. I have a very quick report for you this week. There were no items at the Land Use Committee this week. And the landmark designation for the Lyon-Martin House at 651 Duncan Street passed its second read. That's all I have for you today.

E. GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT

SPEAKERS: Sue Hestor – State Density Bonus presentation

Matt - 249 Texas

Georgia Schuttish – On May 8, 2021 I sent an email for General Public Comment for the May 13, 2021 hearing about two projects that are extreme Alterations. One is 1188 Diamond Street and the second is 3790 21st Street. These Alteration projects were approved during the surge of similar projects throughout Noe Valley in the years following the 2008 economic crisis. As Alterations, they were able to avoid scrutiny under Mandatory Discretionary Reviews and later Conditional Use Authorizations. Six photos show the "before, during and after" for the Alteration. The first slide shows the price history of these two Alterations which shows the exponential price increases. These photos show that the projects are really Demolitions. Only 1188 Diamond has published Demo Calcs. Please consider adjusting the Demo Calcs. They have never been

adjusted, as the Planning Commission is empowered to do under Section 317 (b) (2) (D) in order to preserve housing.

Vintar 3978 22nd street – 642 Alvarado

Russell– 5 Leland

Linda Chapman – State Density Bonus

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.

10. [2021-002990PCA](#) (A. MERLONE: (628) 652-7534)

TEMPORARY CLOSURE OF LIQUOR STORES IN POLK STREET NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL DISTRICT [BF 210287] – Planning Code Amendment – Ordinance amending the Planning Code to provide that temporary closure of liquor stores in the Polk Street NCD (Neighborhood Commercial District) as a result of a major capital improvement project is not an abandonment of such use, and that relocation of such use to another location in the Polk Street NCD does not require a new Conditional Use permit; affirming the Planning Department’s determination under the California Environmental Quality Act; and making findings of consistency with the General Plan, and the eight priority policies of Planning Code, Section 101.1, and findings of public convenience, necessity, and welfare under Planning Code, Section 302.

Preliminary Recommendation: Approve with Modifications

SPEAKERS: + Sunny Angulo, Legislative aide to Sup. Peskin

= Audrey Merlone – Staff report

- Linda Chapman – Senior housing

+ Chris – Support

+ Michael Perillo – Support

+ Anastasia Yovanopoulos - Support

ACTION: Approved with Modifications

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

RESOLUTION: [20916](#)

11. [2021-003184PCAMAP](#) (V. FLORES: (628) 652-7525)

2500-2530 18TH STREET AFFORDABLE HOUSING SPECIAL USE DISTRICT [BF 210182] – Planning Code and Zoning Map Amendments – Amending the Planning Code to create the new 2500-2530 18th Street Affordable Housing Special Use District (Assessor’s Parcel Block No. 4014, Lot Nos. 002 and 002A), to facilitate the development of affordable housing at the site; amending the Zoning Map to rezone the lots from PDR-1-G (Production, Distribution, and Repair, General) to UMU (Urban Mixed Use) and to map the new special use district; affirming the Planning Department’s determination under the California Environmental Quality Act; and making findings of consistency with the General Plan, and the eight priority policies of Planning Code, Section 101.1, and findings of public necessity, convenience, and welfare under Planning Code, Section 302.

Preliminary Recommendation: Approve with Modifications

SPEAKERS: = Veronica Flores – Staff report
 + Speaker – Support
 + Charmaine Curtis – Support
 + Rachel – Support
 + Martha Ryan – Support
 + Tina Cheng – Support
 + Dora Landa - Support
 + Jackie – Support
 + Sophie Hayward – Response to questions
 ACTION: Approved with Modifications
 AYES: Tanner, Chan, Diamond, Fung, Imperial, Moore, Koppel
 RESOLUTION: [20917](#)

12. [2019-021884CWPNV](#) (M. SNYDER: (628) 652-7460)
POTRERO YARD MODERNIZATION PROJECT – 2500 Mariposa Street, the block bounded by Mariposa Street, Bryant Street, 17th Street, and Hampshire Street; Lot 001 in Assessor’s Block 3971 – **Informational Presentation** on a proposal to completely rebuild and expand the Potrero Yard Muni Bus Maintenance Facility with the incorporation of a mixed-use development including approximately 575 dwelling units and other retail and community serving uses. At completion, the development would include a new structure that would range from 75 to 150-feet in height and include approximately 723,000 square feet of bus facility use, approximately 544,000 of residential use, and approximately 33,000 square feet of commercial use. The site is currently within a P (Public) Use District and 65-X Height and Bulk District.

Preliminary Recommendation: None – Informational

SPEAKERS: = Mat Snyder – Staff report
 + Jeffrey Tomlin – SFMTA
 + Licia Ibarra – SFMTA - Project presentation
 + Rafe Rabalais – SFMTA - Project presentation
 + Corey Smith – Advocate maximum number of homes
 + Hunter Cutting -
 - Lorraine – Public land must be 100% affordable
 - Anastasia Yovanopoulos – Public land should be use for 100% affordable housing
 ACTION: Reviewed and Commented

13. [2018-011249CUA-02](#) (A. PERRY: (628) 652-7430)
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 to amend the Conditional Use Authorization granted under Motion 20657 in order to request an additional **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. The project site is located within the Polk Street Neighborhood Commercial District (NCD) and 65-A Height and Bulk District. 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, except that the Project seeks to increase the number of on-site affordable units that will be provided.

Preliminary Recommendation: Approve with Conditions

(Continued from Regular hearing on April 29, 2021)

SPEAKERS: = Andrew Perry – Staff report
 + Steve Vettel – Project sponsor
 - Sue Hestor – Request continuance, State Density Bonus law
 - Linda Chapman – Request continuance, density
 - Fabio Espinela – Request continuance
 = Scott Sanchez – Response to questions

ACTION: Approved with Conditions

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

MOTION: [20918](#)

14. [2020-003042AHB](#) (C. FEENEY: (628) 652-7313)
[4712-4720 3RD STREET](#) – west side of Third Street between Newcomb and Oakdale Avenues, Lot 035 of Assessor's Block 5311 (District 10) – Request for a **HOME-SF Project Authorization** pursuant to Planning Code Section 206.3, 328, and 737 to allow modifications from the rear yard requirement of Planning Code Section 134 and construct a four-story, 40-foot tall residential building (measuring 18,348 gross square feet (GSF)) with 21 dwelling units and a ground floor commercial space (measuring approximately 760 square feet (SF), within the Bayview NCD (Neighborhood Commercial District) Zoning District, Third Street Special Use 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 April 22, 2021)

SPEAKERS: = Claire Feeney – Staff presentation
 + Jeremy Schaub – Project sponsor

ACTION: Approved with Conditions

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

MOTION: [20919](#)

- 15a. [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 121.1, 303, and 712 to demolish the existing one-story commercial building and allow new construction of a four-story, 40-ft tall building with 17 dwelling units and ground floor commercial 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
 (Continued from Regular hearing on April 29, 2021)
- SPEAKERS: = Esmeralda Jardines – Staff report
 + Gary Gee – Project sponsor
 - Paul Ramsey – Parking, street lightning
 - Delia – Concerns
 = Corey Teague – Response to questions
- ACTION: Approved with Conditions
- AYES: Tanner, Chan, Diamond, Fung, Imperial, Moore, Koppel
- MOTION: [20920](#)
- 15b. [2014.1058VAR](#) (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 a **Rear Yard Modification**, pursuant to Planning Code Sections 134 and 305 to allow a reconfigured rear yard on a corner lot for a four-story, 40-ft tall building with 17 dwelling units and ground floor commercial within a NC-3 (Neighborhood Commercial, Moderate Scale) Zoning District and 40-X Height and Bulk District.
 (Continued from Regular hearing on April 29, 2021)
- SPEAKERS: Same as item 15a.
- ACTION: ZA closed the PH and indicated an intent to Grant
16. [2020-000886CUA](#) (M. CHRISTENSEN: (628) 652-7567)
575 VERMONT STREET – located on the east side of Vermont Street between 17th Street and 18th Street; Lot 006 in Assessor’s Block 4010 (District 10) – Request for **Conditional Use Authorization**, pursuant to Planning Code Sections 303 and 317, to demolish the existing one-story single-family residence, determined to not be a historic resource, and construct a new, three-story, 3,318 square foot residential building containing two dwelling units, one accessory dwelling unit, and one off-street auto parking space. 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
- SPEAKERS: = Michael Christensen – Staff report
 + Bridgett Shank – Project sponsor
 - Jessie Carr – Scale, light, air and privacy
 - Speaker – Out of scale, need to be redesigned

- Luke Stevens – Excavation, negative impact
- Victoria Cordero – Negative impact on the quality of life
- Georgia Schuttish – Loss of relative affordability
- Speaker – Design will have a negative impact on the block
- + Speaker – Response to questions
- = Rich Sucre – Response to questions

ACTION: Approved with Conditions as amended to include:

1. A patio for the ADU at grade for the full width of the unit at least ten feet deep;
2. Sponsor continue working with Staff and adjacent neighbors on the north facing fenestration of the top two floors; and
3. The modifications be submitted to the CPC in the form of an update memo.

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

MOTION: [20921](#)

ADJOURNMENT 5:57 PM
ADOPTED MAY 27, 2021