

# SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING COMMISSION



**Thursday, September 23, 2021**  
**1:00 p.m.**  
**Regular Meeting**

**COMMISSIONERS PRESENT:** Tanner, Diamond, Fung, Imperial, Moore, Koppel  
**COMMISSIONERS ABSENT:** Chan

**THE MEETING WAS CALLED TO ORDER BY PRESIDENT KOPPEL AT 1:00 PM**

**STAFF IN ATTENDANCE:** Aaron Starr, Rich Sucre, Chris May, Audrey Merlone, Claire Feeney, David Winslow, Ella Samonsky, Michael Christensen, Kalyani Agnihotri, Scott Sanchez – Acting Zoning Administrator, Rich Hillis – Planning Director, Laura Lynch – Acting 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. 2019-020611CUA (R. SUCRE: (628) 652-7364)  
5114-5116 3<sup>RD</sup> STREET – west side between Bay View Street and Shafter Avenue; Lot 004 in Assessor's Block 5358 (District 10) – Request for **Conditional Use Authorization** pursuant to

Planning Code Sections 303 and 317, to retroactively allow the demolition of a dwelling unit located within a legal nonconforming auxiliary structure at the rear of the subject property within the Bayview NCD (Neighborhood Commercial District) Zoning District, Bayview Hunters Point Area Plan, 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 July 8, 2021)

**(Proposed for Continuance to October 28, 2021)**

SPEAKERS: None

ACTION: Continued to October 28, 2021

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

ABSENT: Chan

- 1b. 2019-020611VAR (R. SUCRE: (628) 652-7364)  
5114-5116 3<sup>RD</sup> STREET – west side between Bay View Street and Shafter Avenue; Lot 004 in Assessor’s Block 5358 (District 10) – Request for **Variances** from the rear yard requirement of Planning Code Sections 134 and the Exposure requirement of Planning Code Section 140. The subject property is located within the Bayview NCD (Neighborhood Commercial District) Zoning District, Bayview Hunters Point Area Plan, and 40-X Height and Bulk District.  
 (Continued from Regular hearing on July 8, 2021)  
**(Proposed for Continuance to October 28, 2021)**

SPEAKERS: None

ACTION: ZA Continued to October 28, 2021

2. 2020-005729CUA (C. MAY: (628) 652-7959)  
4 SEACLIFF AVENUE – north end of 25<sup>th</sup> Avenue; Lot 017 in Assessor’s Block 1302 (District 1) – Request for **Conditional Use Authorization**, pursuant to Planning Code Sections 303 and 317 to permit the demolition of the existing single-family dwelling and the construction of a new three-story single-family dwelling with an ADU on the subject property within a RH-1(D) (Residential-House, One-Family - Detached) Zoning District, Lobos Creek Conservation Area, 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 October 28, 2021)**

SPEAKERS: None

ACTION: Continued to October 28, 2021

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

ABSENT: Chan

3. 2020-003971PCA (A. MERLONE: (628) 652-7534)  
DWELLING UNIT DENSITY EXCEPTION FOR CORNER LOTS IN RESIDENTIAL DISTRICTS [BOARD FILE NO. 210564] - Planning Code Amendment - Ordinance amending the Planning Code to provide a density limit exception for Corner Lots in RH (Residential, House) zoning districts, to permit up to four dwelling units per lot; 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.  
**(Proposed for Continuance to October 28, 2021)**

SPEAKERS: None  
 ACTION: Continued to October 28, 2021  
 AYES: Tanner, Diamond, Fung, Imperial, Moore, Koppel  
 ABSENT: Chan

9. [2019-022661CUA](#) (C. FEENEY: (628) 652-7313)  
628 SHOTWELL STREET – west side between 20<sup>th</sup> and 21<sup>st</sup> Streets; Lot 026 of Assessor's Block 3611 (District 9) – Request for **Conditional Use Authorization** pursuant to Planning Code Sections 209.1 and 303 and Board of Supervisors File No. 210157 to allow the change in use of a Residential Care Facility to two dwelling units within a RH-3 (Residential-House Three-Family) Zoning District and 40-X Height and Bulk District. This action constitutes the Approval Action for the project for the purposes of CEQA, pursuant to San Francisco Administrative Code Section [31.04\(h\)](#).  
*Preliminary Recommendation: Approve with Conditions*  
 (Continued from Regular hearing on July 8, 2021)

SPEAKERS: None  
 ACTION: Continued to October 7, 2021  
 AYES: Tanner, Diamond, Fung, Imperial, Moore, Koppel  
 ABSENT: Chan

16. [2021-000269DRP-02](#) (D. WINSLOW: (628) 652-7335)  
3669 21<sup>ST</sup> STREET – south side between Sanchez and Church Streets; Lot 054 in Assessor's Block 3620 (District 8) – Request for **Discretionary Review** of Building Permit Application nos. 2020.1228.1772 and 2020.1226.1735 for the demolition of a one-story-over-basement, single-family residence and construction of a new three-story-over-basement/garage, single-family residence with an Accessory Dwelling Unit within a RH-1 (Residential House, One-Family) Zoning District and 40-X Height and Bulk District. Demolition of the existing dwelling is subject to administrative review and approval pursuant to Planning Code Section 317(d)(3)(B). 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: Withdrawn

**D. GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT**

At this time, members of the public may address the Commission on items of interest to the public that are within the subject matter jurisdiction of the Commission except agenda items. With respect to agenda items, your opportunity to address the Commission will be afforded when the item is reached in the meeting. Each member of the public may address the Commission for up to three minutes. When the number of speakers exceed the 15-minute limit, General Public Comment may be moved to the end of the Agenda.

**SPEAKERS:** Linda Chapman – If I had three minutes for public comment...  
 Georgia Schuttish – Extreme excavation  
 David Osgood – Environmental progress regressing  
 Francisco De Costa – Build high rise, lack quality of life  
 David – Staff reports lack state housing laws, HAA, SB 330, CEQA exempt

**B. COMMISSION MATTERS****4. Consideration of Adoption:**

- [Draft Minutes for July 22, 2021](#)

**SPEAKERS:** None  
**ACTION:** Adopted as Amended  
**AYES:** Tanner, Diamond, Fung, Imperial, Moore, Koppel  
**ABSENT:** Chan

- [Draft Minutes for September 2, 2021](#)
- [Draft Minutes for September 9, 2021](#)

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

**5. Commission Comments/Questions****Commissioner Tanner:**

Thank you so much for filling in this afternoon, also for Jonas, you're doing a great job. So thank you for leading us through. I wanted to ask and you may address this, Director Hillis in your comments, but there have been a flurry of state laws that are being adopted and signed by the governor and just wondering how you're planning to bring those to us. And in particular which ones are you thinking that will require implementing legislation? My read on SB9 is that there's some latitude for design review and certain requirements that we can have and just how you're thinking of approaching that legislation in particular. But there will be other pieces that we also need to address as well. That's my question.

**Rich Hillis, Planning Director:**

Thank you, Commissioner Tanner. So, we've got a hearing on calendar for October 21<sup>st</sup> to talk about SB9 and 10. Their implications and potentially talk about any changes to our code that we have to make to implement those. I think they seem fairly straightforward

but when you get in to the details of analyzing them and how they intersect with both our existing code and existing state laws especially around ADUs, it gets complicated, especially SB9 fairly quickly. So it may seem that's a bit far out but we wanted that time to make sure we can answer those questions and bring them to you and have a robust discussion. So that is scheduled for the 21<sup>st</sup>.

**Commissioner Tanner:**

Thank you.

## C. DEPARTMENT MATTERS

### 6. Director's Announcements

**Rich Hillis, Planning Director:**

Good afternoon, Commissioners. I just want to briefly touch on some organizational shifts within the department. And I apologize I think they were mentioned last week during public comment for not bringing these to you earlier. I don't view them as enormous or a huge changes. Staff generally stay in the same roles and their functions aren't changed. And hopefully the biggest impact will be increased collaboration and consistency within the department and to facilitate the complicated job of our planners in increasingly complicated regulatory environment, things like SB9 and 10 that we just mentioned. So, two components to it, one merging Zoning and Compliance into Current Planning. The role of the Zoning Administrator, and Corey in this case remain exactly the same, the ZA and their duties, including Enforcement, Short-Term Rentals, TDM, the Zoning Administrator's authority and the code and charter to opine on variances, code interpretations and issue LODs remains unchanged. Also, Kate Connor and her team who were formally under Dan Sider's shop, the Office of Executive Programs also merged under Current Planning. And you're obviously familiar with Kate and her work around the State Density Bonus, other state laws like SB35 and 330, BMRs, our liaison to the Rent Board, etc. So I know you share the great respect and admiration I have for both those functions because they're playing an ever important and complicated role in our analysis of projects. So that the notion is that they continue and actually be enhanced. But, again, the goal of this is to make the jobs of those who are managing project review easier with issues around Zoning, State Density Bonus, and other state laws, historic design. I wanted the folks making decisions and looking at projects housed in one division. I also think it is an opportunity to expand the knowledge of these issues for planners and ultimately more opportunities for advancement within the department. So, I just wanted to highlight this and as always kind of no change, no matter how minor I may think it is, doesn't go without some scrutiny. So, Supervisor Peskin has asked for a hearing on these changes, which I'm happy to go and explain to them into the board and others about it. Supervisor Peskin, to my knowledge, didn't call me or Liz or Corey about this change prior to calling for the hearing but happy to go talk to them at that -- at a hearing of the board. I also wanted to mention some staff promotions within Current Planning. So, Natalia Kwiatkowska, who you have seen here and encountered, especially on issues of ADUs, becomes a Flex team leader and she was in that acting role previous to this. Sylvia Jimenez is our new Southwest team leader taking over for Delvin who retired earlier, and Rich Sucre was promoted to fill Liz Watty's vacant position as Deputy Director of Current Planning. So, I wanted to make note of those changes too, I'm happy to answer questions if you have them.

**Commissioner Imperial:**

Director Hillis, I would just advise with as your reorganizing the structure of the Planning Department to give us, the Planning Commissioner, ahead of time of all these changes. At least for me it's good to hear and thank you for giving us an update. But I think in the future it will be great as well for us to know of any changes and I believe also as these change is happening for us to be informed in terms of like what it means like reorganizing the Zoning Administrator under Current Planning and I believe that most of the comments was the losing the economy and I think that is also something that we need to clarify in terms of the autonomous decision making of the Zoning Administrator and you know this. And at the same time what does it mean when the Zoning Administrator under Current Planning when usually when the Planning Director is not around the Zoning Administrator is the substitute as well. But with that entails as well. Perhaps that will be discussed in the Board of Supervisors that will be also good for us to know what this restructuring really means.

**Rich Hillis, Planning Director:**

And just to add. I think it is really important to emphasize, I don't get involved in the Zoning Administrator's decisions around variances or code interpretations, which may be Letters of Determination. I don't expect Ms. Watty to either. That function remains the same. I think what is important is to have that collaboration and consistency throughout the department. And so, having that knowledge within Current Planning who planners are dealing with kind of how the code applies to projects everyday is critical. And so, having that consistency and collaboration I think is extremely important and was kind of the primary factor in my decision to make that change. But I appreciate and apologize for not bringing it to you earlier.

**Commissioner Imperial:**

Thank you, Director Hillis.

SPEAKER: Ozzie Rohm – Planning re-organization concerns

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

**Aaron Starr, Manager of Legislation Affairs:**

Good afternoon, Commissioners. Aaron Starr, Manager of Legislation Affairs. I hope you are enjoying this beautiful San Francisco summer day on the second day of fall. While you were on break last week, the Board did meet. So this report will cover both last week and this week's board hearings. Last week the Committee considered the Landmark Designation for the Ingleside Terraces Sundial at Sundial Park. This ordinance was originally sponsored by Supervisor Yee but Supervisor Melgar took up the sponsorship after he left office. She also had to be recused from the hearing because she lived within 500 feet of the Sundial Park. Ingleside Terraces Sundial and Sundial Park are located on the Entrada Court cul-de-sac at the Ingleside Terraces neighborhood. The Park and Sundial are significant for association with the development of resident park neighborhoods in San Francisco in the early 20<sup>th</sup> century and as distinctive examples of the ornamental landscape features common in these developments. It is also significant as a visual landmark associated with the Ingleside Terraces neighborhood. This landmark designation was initiated by the board in December of 2020 and recommended for landmark status by the

Historic Preservation Commission in April of this year. There was one caller in favor of the landmark designation. The Committee unanimously forwarded the item to the full board with a positive recommendation. Next on the agenda was Supervisor Mandelman's ordinance that would require Conditional Use Authorization for the removal of residential care facilities and make residential care facilities principally permitted in most zoning districts. Commissioners, you heard this item on July 22<sup>nd</sup> of this year and recommended approval with modifications. The Commission's proposed modifications were as follows: 1) to modify the provisions which requires Conditional Use Authorization to remove the residential care facility to sunset after three years; 2) encourage the sponsor and other city agencies to continue to seek and support non land use solutions to alleviate financial burdens faced by residential care facilities; 3) amend the ordinance to only require Conditional Use Authorization for the proposed removal of a residential care facility if the facility was established legally; and finally 4) modify the first Conditional Use criteria to allow other parties that may be relevant to the case to be consulted. Unfortunately, none of the Commissions' recommendation modifications made it into the ordinance which was a surprise to staff. There were two callers during public comment, one in support of the ordinance and one who expressed various concerns of the matter. At the end, the Committee then forwarded the item to the full board as a Committee Report with positive recommendation. Finally, the Committee held a hearing on the ongoing saga at 2861 San Bruno Avenue. As you probably know, this project was originally allowed to have 10 units and ended up having 30. At the hearing, Planning was represented by Corey Teague and Tina Tam. However, most of the questions focused on DBI and how a project like this was able to happen within the department. Supervisors focused on the system manipulations by department staff and importantly what they were doing to prevent this from happening now and in the future. They also expressed confidence in the interim Director Patrick O'Riordan. The Supervisors had some tough questions for the City Attorney's office over the agreement as well. At the end of the hearing, the item was marked, heard and filed. This project is scheduled to come to this Commission on September 30<sup>th</sup> but the project sponsors just submitted the plan revision so the hearing will be continued. At the full board last week, Supervisor Mandelman's ordinance to require Conditional Use Authorization for the Residential Care Facilities passed its first read.

This week at the Land Use Committee hearing, the Committee considered the Landmark Designation ordinance for the Making of Fresco, by Diego Rivera, also my background. Supervisor Peskin sponsored the legislation. The HPC recommended an approval of the Landmark Designation on May 5<sup>th</sup>, 2021. The Fresco is culturally and historically significant as the work of the [inaudible] Mexican artist, Diego Rivera, for association with Art Education of the San Francisco Art Institute and the New Deal Era WPA mural program, and for association with the LatinX and ChicanoX Arts Community Mission Mural Movement. The period of significance is 1931 to 1974. There were two public commentors and the item was then forwarded to the full board with a positive recommendation. Next the Committee considered Supervisor Peskin's ordinance that would amend the Zoning controls in Chinatown, North Beach and Polk Street with the intention of supporting small businesses in those districts. The Planning Commission heard this item on August 26<sup>th</sup> and recommended approval with modifications. Those modifications included some technical amendments and a recommendation to retain the 3-year abandonment period. There were about a dozen callers in support including from the Chinatown Community Development Corporation, Chinatown Media and Arts Collaborative and the Community Youth Center. Comments stand around support for more flexibility and the Chinatown

mixed use districts and the opportunity for social service and philanthropic facilities to exceed the maximum use size with Conditional Use Authorization. Except for the 3-year abandonment period the Supervisor included all the Planning Commission's recommended modifications. There is no significant discussion or comments from the Committee members. And with the amendments approved, the item was continued one week so that the City Attorney's office could draft the required amendments.

At the full board this week, Supervisor Mandelman's Residential Care Facilities ordinance passed its second read. The Ingleside Terraces Sundial and Sundial Park Landmark Designation passed its first read. And finally, the board heard the Conditional Use appeal for the Cannabis Retail business located at 5801 Mission Street doing businesses as ReLeaf. Commissioners, you heard this case on June 10<sup>th</sup> of this year and voted four to two to approve the project. The appellant had three main concerns in their appeal. First concern with clustering of cannabis storefronts in District 11; second, the proposed project is an area with a high density of children including the San Francisco Christian Center facility well used by school aged children; and three, the lack of appropriate outreach among the [inaudible] residents. During staff's presentation, planner Ryan Balba refuted each of these points noting the the closest cannabis retail was over at 3,000 ft away and that the project did not run a foul on the 600 buffering requirement for other cannabis retails or schools. And that the initial outreach required by the Office of Cannabis was conducted appropriately and by the Good Neighbor policies. There were dozens of public commentors on this item both for and against the project. The issues discussed were fairly like those that this Commission heard at their June 10<sup>th</sup> hearing. After public comment, Supervisor Ronen made a motion to reject the appeal and approve the project as proposed. This was seconded by Supervisor Melgar. Next, Supervisor Safai spoke. He [inaudible] his commitment to his constituents that he would not support another cannabis location in his district and that since he had given his word he could not support the project. The clerk then called the vote and Supervisor Ronen's motion carried 8-3 with Supervisors Safai, Chan and Mar in decent. And that concludes my report. Thank you very much for your attention and I am available for any questions you might have.

**Laura Lynch, Acting Secretary:**

The Board of Appeals did meet last night but there were no items of interest to the Planning Commission to report.

And the Historic Preservation Commission did meet last week as well. There was an officer's election that was held. Commissioner Matsuda was elected as President and Commissioner Nageswaran was nominated as Vice President. Additionally, an item of interest to the Commission was the Draft EIR Hearing at 1101-1123 Sutter Street where the Commission provided comments on the Draft EIR. This item is anticipated to be before this body at your next hearing on September 30<sup>th</sup>.

**E. 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.



8. [2021-001791PCA](#) (A. MERLONE: (628) 652-7534)  
**REVIEW OF LARGE RESIDENCE DEVELOPMENTS – Planning Code Amendment** to require Conditional Use Authorization for certain large residence developments in RH (Residential, House) Zoning Districts; 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*  
 (Continued from Regular hearing on July 22, 2021)  
**Note: On July 22, 2021, after hearing and closing public comment, continued to September 23, 2021 by a vote of +6 -0 (Chan absent).**

**SPEAKERS:**

- = Audrey Merlone – Staff Report
- + Jacob Bintliff, Sup. Mandelman’s Aide – Legislation introduction
- Christopher Roach – Will not achieve the intent of affordable housing
- Ozzie Rohm – Will encourage developers to demolish, demo eviction
- Mara Abernathy – Will increase CU hearings, won’t deter large homes
- David Kellogg – Accountability Act, add process and slow things down
- = Caroline Kennedy – Support but not misguided version of legislation
- Karen Hasting – Support intent, leg doesn’t benefit goal
- Ross Levy – Support intent, legislation is now muddled
- Julie – Don’t need more limitations for improvements, four plex leg
- Luke – Doesn’t recognize growing middle-class families, increase cost
- Corey Smith – Support to incentivize small family housing
- Matt Weiss – Only benefiting Noe Valley, outreach
- + Georgia Schuttish – Noe Valley epicenter of de facto demolitions
- Sarah Wilmer – Leg is anti-family
- David Gast – Grandfathering should be the effective date of the leg
- Jonathan Randolph – Limiting amount of building space
- Robert Huffman – Zoning and home size, allow more apartments

**ACTION:** Disapproved with recommendations

- Staff should work with affected areas. Community outreach should be completed based on areas of concern.
- Encourage density
- Explore a form-based approach for the size limitation
- Look at tenant protection
- Ensure that unfinished area can be converted to finished area without triggering the legislation provisions
- The date the legislation would go into effect would be the date of the law and grandfathering should not go back to a prior date.

**AYES:** Tanner, Diamond, Fung, Imperial, Moore, Koppel  
**ABSENT:** Chan  
**RESOLUTION:** [20991](#)

10. [2015-012577CUA](#) (M. WOODS: (628) 652-7350)  
**1200 VAN NESS AVENUE** – northeast corner of Post Street; Lots 003 and 005 in Assessor’s Block 0691 (District 3) – Request for **Conditional Use Authorization** pursuant to Planning Code Sections 209.3, 243, 253, 253.2, 271, 303 and 304 to allow a Planned Unit Development (PUD) for the demolition of the existing building complex and the

construction of a 13-story mixed use building, mainly 107 dwelling units, approximately 118,400 square feet of health service uses and 270 parking spaces. The proposal includes PUD modifications to Planning Code provisions related to rear yard (Section 134), open space technical standards (Section 135), dwelling unit exposure (Section 140), ground floor ceiling height (Section 145.1), off-street loading technical standards (Section 154) and floor area premium for corner lots (Sections 125 and 243). The project site is within a RC-4 (Residential-Commercial, High Density) Zoning District, Van Ness SUD (Special Use District), Van Ness Automotive SUD (Special Use District), Van Ness Avenue Area Plan, and 130-V 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 July 22, 2021)

SPEAKERS: + Danny Campbell – Mixed use, health services, housing, jobs  
 +Daniel Grey – Support, jobs  
 +Andrea Carlmichael – improvements to Lower Polk  
 + John Corosso- Support, jobs, housing  
 -Linda Chapman- deny or continue with modifications, Van Ness Plan  
 +Dan Thores- Support  
 - Marlene Morgan – Housing units, large parking, no medical office

ACTION: Approved with Conditions including modifications read into the record by staff related to open space.

AYES: Tanner, Diamond, Fung, Koppel

NAYS: Imperial, Moore

ABSENT: Chan

MOTION: [20992](#)

11. [2017-000663OFA-02](#) (E. SAMONSKY: (628) 652-7417)  
[610-698 BRANNAN STREET](#) – north side between 5<sup>th</sup> and 6<sup>th</sup> Streets; Lots 001B, 002B, 004, 005, 047, and 048 in Assessor’s Block 3778 (District 6) – Request for an **Office Development Authorization** pursuant to Planning Code Sections 321, and 322, to authorize up to 676,801 square feet (sf) from the Office Development Annual Limit, for the Phase 1b and 1c of the project at 610-698 Brannan Street (known as the San Francisco Flower Mart Project) within a CMUO (Central SoMa-Mixed Use Office) and MUR (Mixed Use - Residential) Zoning Districts and 160-CS and 270-CS Height and Bulk Districts. The approval action for the project for the purposes of CEQA, pursuant to San Francisco Administrative Code Section [31.04\(h\)](#) was the Planning Commission’s approval of the large project authorization that occurred July 18, 2019.

*Preliminary Recommendation: Approve with Conditions*

SPEAKERS: -Speaker – Against approval  
 +Rodney Fong – Support

ACTION: Approved with Conditions

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

ABSENT: Chan

MOTION: [20993](#)

12. [2020-007565CUA-02](#) (C. MAY: (628) 652-7959)  
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 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, 8,700 square-foot, residential building containing three 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: - Ozzie Rohm- Tenant occupied building, what happens to tenant with demolition  
 - Speaker- Modification to expand lightwell and construction concerns  
 = Jonathan Randolph – Van accessible parking requirement. SB 330
- ACTION: Approved with Conditions including the addition of a community liaison condition of approval
- AYES: Tanner, Diamond, Fung, Moore, Koppel
- NAYS: Imperial
- ABSENT: Chan
- MOTION: [20994](#)
- 13a. [2017-015648CUA](#) (M. CHRISTENSEN: (628) 652-7567)  
952 CAROLINA STREET – west side between 22<sup>nd</sup> and 23<sup>rd</sup> Streets; Lot 009 in Assessor's Block 4160 (District 10) – Request for **Conditional Use Authorization**, pursuant to Planning Code Section 209.1, 303, and 317, to authorize the partial demolition of a one-story residential building containing one dwelling unit and for construction of a three-story, 29'6" tall rear addition containing one additional dwelling unit and one off-street auto parking space, increasing the size of the building from 630 square feet to 3,297 square feet. The project 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: None
- ACTION: Approved with Conditions
- AYES: Tanner, Diamond, Fung, Moore, Koppel
- NAYS: Imperial
- ABSENT: Chan
- MOTION: [20995](#)
- 13b. [2017-015648VAR](#) (M. CHRISTENSEN: (628) 652-7567)  
952 CAROLINA STREET – west side between 22<sup>nd</sup> and 23<sup>rd</sup> Streets; Lot 009 in Assessor's Block 4160 (District 10) – Request for **Variance** from the Front Setback requirement of Planning Code Section 132, for a project that proposes to partially demolish an existing single-family home and to relocate the historic portion of the home to the northern property line, located 5' 0 ½" from the front property line where at 9' 8" Front Setback is required based on the average condition of the two adjacent properties.

SPEAKERS: Same as item 13a.  
 ACTION: ZA Closed the PH and indicated an intent to Grant

14. [2019-019901CUA](#) (M. CHRISTENSEN: (628) 652-7567)  
1068 FLORIDA STREET – west side between 22<sup>nd</sup> and 23<sup>rd</sup> Streets; Lot 011 in Assessor's Block 4149 (District 9) – Request for **Conditional Use Authorization**, pursuant to Planning Code Section 209.1, 303, and 317, to legalize the unpermitted demolition of a two-story residential building containing two dwelling units and for new construction of a four-story, 37' tall residential building containing two dwelling units and one Accessory Dwelling Unit. The project is located within a RH-2 (Residential-House, Two-Family) Zoning District, Calle 24 SUD (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*

SPEAKERS: = Michael Christensen – Staff Report  
 + Jonathan Randolph – Not Commission's job to punish  
 - Nancy Coffman – Replace tarp, clean garbage, liaison to project  
 - Georgia Schuttish - is owner going to manage units, speculation

ACTION: Approved with Conditions  
 AYES: Tanner, Diamond, Fung, Koppel  
 NAYS: Imperial, Moore  
 ABSENT: Chan  
 MOTION: [20996](#)

15. [2021-004901CUA](#) (K. AGNIHOTRI: (628) 652-7454)  
1111 CALIFORNIA STREET – southwest corner of Taylor Street; Lot 020 in Assessor's Block 0253 (District 3) – Request for **Conditional Use Authorization** pursuant to Planning Code Sections 209.2, and 303, to permit the installation of a new AT&T Mobility Macro Wireless Telecommunication Services Facility at the rooftop of the existing three-story auditorium building, consisting of six (6) new antennas and ancillary equipment as part of the AT&T Mobility Telecommunications Network. Antennas and ancillary equipment will be screened within one (1) FRP enclosure. The project is located within a RM-4 (Residential – Mixed, High Density) Zoning District and 65-A 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 September 9, 2021)

SPEAKERS: = Kalyani Agnihotri – Staff Report  
 + Eric Lentz – Project Sponsor response to questions  
 - Phillip Woods – Location impact views of resident at 1177 CA Street

ACTION: Approved with Conditions including moving the antennas 10-15 feet to the East

AYES: Tanner, Diamond, Fung, Imperial, Moore, Koppel  
 ABSENT: Chan  
 MOTION: [20997](#)

ADJOURNMENT 5:49 PM  
ADOPTED AS AMENDED OCTOBER 7, 2021