

SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING COMMISSION



Meeting Minutes Remote Hearing via video and teleconferencing

Thursday, December 9, 2021
1:00 p.m.
Regular Meeting

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

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

STAFF IN ATTENDANCE: Aaron Starr, Veronica Flores, Linda Ajello-Hoagland, Jeff Horn, Nicholas Foster, Carly Grob, Michael Christensen, David Winslow, 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. [2021-006098CUA](#) (M. CHRISTENSEN: (628) 652-7567)
1358 SOUTH VAN NESS AVENUE – west side between 24th and 25th Streets; Lot 008 in Assessor's Block 6518 (District 9) – Request for **Conditional Use Authorization** pursuant to Planning Code Sections 209.4, 303, and 317, to authorize the demolition of the existing 4,182 square foot, three-story, twelve-room single-family residence and separate garage

structure, and construction of a new, 8,250 square foot, four-story, forty-foot-tall residential building containing eight dwelling units, within a RTO-M (Residential Transit Oriented – Mission) Zoning District, Calle 24 SUD (Special Use District), and 50-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 January 13, 2022)

SPEAKERS: Speaker – Continue

ACTION: Continued to January 13, 2022

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

- 2a. 2019-020611CUA (R. SUCRE: (628) 652-7364)
5114-5116 3RD 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 October 28, 2021)

(Proposed for Indefinite Continuance)

SPEAKERS: None

ACTION: Continued Indefinitely

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

- 2b. 2019-020611VAR (R. SUCRE: (628) 652-7364)
5114-5116 3RD STREET – west side between Bay View Street and Shafter Avenue; Lot 004 in Assessor’s Block 5358 (District 10) – Request for **Variations** 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 October 28, 2021)

(Proposed for Indefinite Continuance)

SPEAKERS: None

ACTION: Continued Indefinitely

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

3. 2018-015983VAR (L. HOAGLAND: (628) 652-7320)
136 DELMAR STREET – east side between Frederick and Piedmont Streets; Lot 067A in Assessor’s Block 1270 (District 8) – Request for **Variance** from the front setback pursuant to Planning Code Section 132. The subject property is located within a RH-2 (Residential-House, Two-Family) Zoning District and 40-X Height and Bulk District.
 (Continued from Regular hearing on October 21, 2021)

WITHDRAWN

SPEAKERS: None
 ACTION: Withdrawn

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. [2021-009720CUA](#) (L. HOAGLAND: (628) 652-7320)
556 HAYES STREET – north side between Laguna and Octavia Streets; Lot 007 in Assessor's Block 0807 (District 5) – Request for **Conditional Use Authorization**, pursuant to Planning Code Section 303 and 761 to authorize a liquor store (d.b.a. True Sake) to operate in a 1,440 square-foot, ground floor retail space of the subject property, within the Hayes-Valley NCT-3 (Neighborhood Commercial) 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: [21044](#)

C. COMMISSION MATTERS

5. Consideration of Adoption:
 • [2022 Hearing Schedule](#)

SPEAKERS: None
 ACTION: Adopted as proposed with the following amendments:
 Cancel March 17th;
 Reinstate March 31st;
 Cancel May 5th;
 Reinstate June 30th;
 Cancel July 7th; and
 Cancel October 27th.
 AYES: Tanner, Chan, Diamond, Fung, Imperial, Moore, Koppel

6. Commission Comments/Questions

Commissioner Diamond:

We've been reading a lot in the paper about issues surrounding the parklets and additional proposed legislation that the Mayor has come out with, and I wonder Director Hillis, if you could summarize for us where the parklet issue stands and the role that the Planning Department is playing in this discussion?

Rich Hillis, Planning Director:

Sure. And I was going to mention this during my comment, but happy to talk about it now. And you're correct. There's been some recent media coverage about it. As you all know, that was a program that was implemented quickly but I think successfully in response to the Covid shut down that kept many of our businesses up and running and commercial corridors active and vibrant over the past 18 months. And one, I just wanted to recognize the incredible work that our team, led by Robin Abad did, as well as representatives from other agencies. But, as we shift now into a more permanent phase of the program, the legislation you recommended and that the Board approved requires spaces to meet minimum requirements, especially around fire, life safety, and disability access. And we recognize that there are some issues with operators complying and needing to modify their spaces but our goal is to make that process transparent and easy on small business owners. So, the legislation you originally recommended and the Board adopted extended a grace period for compliance from December 31st of this year to July 1st, 2022 of next year. Mayor Breed this morning announced that she is introducing legislation to extend the temporary program. So in essence extending that grace period to January 1, 2023. And further, she directed that citations and any related fines be suspended for the time being and that compliance will proceed for those with the most significant life safety issues. So this gives us, I think, it's good news, it gives us more time for outreach, education to engage with operators especially those that have more severe issues that need to be recognized. We absolutely recognized the importance of the program and keeping businesses open so we will work with the Mayor's office and other agencies to ensure its continued success. And that small business owners understand and are able to meet the guidelines. So that is where things stand today. I just wanted to remind to anybody who is listening that that Equity Grant program which can provide some financial assistance to meet some of these goals, applications are available. They are online on the Shared Spaces website and those applications will be accepted until February 28th.

Commissioner Diamond:

Thanks for that clarification.

Rich Hillis, Planning Director:

Yup.

D. DEPARTMENT MATTERS**7. Director's Announcements****Rich Hillis, Planning Director:**

So, good afternoon. I wanted to mention that Shared Spaces item so thank you for bringing it up Commissioner Diamond. Also, just one other item, I think it came up during General Public Comment a week ago or before about our memo that we talked about an analysis of the financial feasibility of potential SB 9 related projects. And we had expected to get that out earlier, but there has been some back and forth with our consultants on the types of projects we wanted them to analyze. So, we will have that to you and to the public as well in early January. And that is all I have.

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

Aaron Starr, Manager of Legislative Affairs:

Land Use Committee

- 210381 Planning Code - Massage Establishment Zoning Controls. Sponsors: Ronen; Mandelman. Staff: V. Flores.

This week at land use, the Committee finally passed Supervisor Ronen' ordinance that amends our Massage controls out of committee with a positive recommendation. If you recall last week the item was amended to include the PC's recommended modification, and then continue for one week because the amendments were deemed substantive.

Full Board

- 210810 Planning Code - Business Signs on Awnings and Marquees. Sponsors: Stefani; Chan. Staff: Merlone. PASSED Second Read
- 210452 Planning Code - Exemption from Neighborhood Notification and Review Requirements for Grandfathered Medical Cannabis Dispensaries Converting to Cannabis Retail. Sponsor: Mayor Staff: Christensen. Passed First Read.
- 211187 Hearing - Appeal of Conditional Use Authorization Approval - 3832-18th Street. Staff: Jimenez. Continued to January
- 210381 Planning Code - Massage Establishment Zoning Controls. Sponsors: Ronen; Mandelman. Staff: V. Flores. Passed First Read.

Corey Teague, Zoning Administrator:

The Board of Appeals did meet last night and had one item of interest to the Commission. Specifically there was an appeal of a Letter of Determination that I had issued regarding the project at 88 Bluxome Street. If you recall, the Commission reviewed and approved that project in July of 2019. It was a Large Project Authorization for a large office development on a key site in Central SoMa. Beyond the office component of the project, it also included numerous other components including several community benefits that were called out in the Central SoMa plan, including a linear park, a land dedication for affordable housing, and a community recreation center with two pools as well as a child care center. If you recall, it did also include the replacement of the SF Tennis Club facility within basement levels of that project. Subsequent to those approvals, it was well reported that Pinterest signed on to be anchor tenant and then eventually pulled out from that. Subsequent to that, there was also reporting that the developer, Alexandria, were going to use the provision in the private agreement that they had signed with the San Franciscans for Sports and Recreation regarding the replacement of the tennis facility to remove the tennis facility from the project and present a payment to that organization in lieu. The question arose as to whether or not that change to the project was a significant modification that would require new Large Project Authorization approval from the Planning Commission. And that was the request for determination from that organization. I issued that determination earlier this year finding that it was not a significant modification that required the Planning Commission to approve a new Large Project Authorization, but that it was substantial enough that we would require an informational presentation to the Planning Commission prior to those permits to revise

the project being issued. So that was the matter that was heard last night. There were I believe more than 100 supporters of the tennis facility online. I'm not sure how many of them actually spoke but it was substantial. The Board members all kind of acknowledged that it was a challenging decision and also somewhat unique and unusual in terms of the types of changes we see for projects between entitlement and permit. But ultimately, they did vote unanimously to overturn that determination and they ruled that in order to remove the tennis facility from the project, it would require a new Large Project Authorization from the Planning Commission. And I'm available for any questions you may have about that case.

Commissioner Moore:

I would like to ask Mr. Teague to give us one or two more points about exactly for the reasoning of why the Board of Appeals held that way. I considered a change on land use, I considered a reduction in community benefit over a semi private facility. I'm just curious to get a slightly more subtle understanding of why they revoked it.

Corey Teague, Zoning Administrator:

Sure. Just for a little context, the standard condition that we have in Planning Commission motions on this issue against that states significant modification require a new approval from the Planning Commission but that the Zoning Administrator couldn't approve other modifications. It doesn't provide really any other guidance as to what is a significant modification, and there is no real guidance within the Planning code on that either. So it is a somewhat subjective determination although we do try to use common metrics and principles and concepts when reviewing these situations because it's common that projects change, to some degree, between entitlement and permitting. Although it's usually fairly minor. My determination, I looked at the specific findings that were made in the condition of approval -- or the motion of approval and the fact that the other community benefits were conditioned in the motion and the tennis club replacement was not conditioned in the motion. And the fact that the tennis facility was completely below grade at the basement level, and so it would have no kind of exterior impact to the project. And because of the layout removing it also would not have impact to any of the other uses or benefits in the project. The Board of Appeals felt like the overall area that it represented, which was a little more than 11% of the total area of the project was high. And also felt that the nature in which the replacement had been presented as a key component of the project when it was presented to the Planning Commission, so the way it was represented, and also the significance of the facility itself, there was a lot of discussion about the fact that even though it is operated as a private, it's still open to anyone to join for a membership and they do a lot of other kind of programs. And it is the only indoor -- or was the only indoor tennis facility in the City. And so there was some additional conversation about that being a worthy consideration for how significant this replacement facility was to the project overall.

Commissioner Moore:

Thank you. That was extremely helpful for me to get a broader perspective. Thank you so much.

E. GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT

SPEAKERS: Georgia Schuttish – According to the DBI Code Advisory Committee meeting on 12/8, Information Sheet EG-02 can't be used in the design of projects filing applications after October 22, 2021. I think the design

professionals are aware of this but the meeting didn't mention Planning and I wanted to be sure the Commission and Staff but most importantly the public knew about this fairly major change. Thanks to Director Hillis for announcing that the Financial Analysis on SB 9 discussed on page 10 of the October 21, 2021 Staff Report on these State Bills will be published in early January 2022. Is there an estimated date for an Informational Hearing on Demo Calcs? On October 7th Director Hillis said possibly in early 2022. Adjusting the Demo Calcs per Section 317 (b) (2) (D) could preserve existing housing which is, "...a resource in need of protection" per Section 317 Findings.

Speaker – Teleconferencing process

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.

9. [2020-008417CWP](#) (J. PAPPAS: (628) 652-7470)
RECOVERY STRATEGIES – ECONOMIC RECOVERY UPDATE – **Informational Presentation** – Update on San Francisco's economic recovery from the COVID-19 pandemic including context and information covering economic sectors, workers and jobs, and retail districts. The presentation includes discussion of efforts to support the recovery of the City Core, including Downtown Office and Union Square, and neighborhood retail and services. This update is part of ongoing recovery strategies by the Planning Department, the Office of Economic and Workforce Development (OEWD), Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development (MOHCD), and other City agencies to support an equitable recovery.
Preliminary Recommendation: None – Informational
 (Continued from Regular hearing on December 2, 2021)

SPEAKERS: = Rich Hillis – Staff presentation
 = Katie Sofis – OEWD presentation

ACTION: Reviewed and Commented

10. [2021-011130PCA](#) (V. FLORES: (628) 652-7525)
AUTOMOTIVE USES; HOUSING DENSITY [BF 211092] – **Planning Code Amendments** to increase density on lots with auto-oriented uses where housing is permitted, but which do not currently have any residential use or a legacy business, and remove the Conditional Use requirement to change the use of an Automobile Service Station or Automotive Use to another use and amend zoning control tables to reflect this change; affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act; making findings of consistency with the General Plan, and the eight priority policies of Planning Code, Section 101.1; and making findings of public necessity, convenience, and welfare as required by Planning Code, Section 302.
Preliminary Recommendation: Approve with Modifications

SPEAKERS: = Veronica Flores – Staff report
 + Paul Maldonado – Support

- + Madeline Boyd – Support
- + Jordan Wayne – Support
- + Jim Chappell – Support
- + Emily – Racial justice and climate justice
- Anastasia Yovanopoulos – People who live and work in PDR spaces
- + Matt – Creative way to address housing and environmental concerns
- + Madison – Addresses housing shortage and affordability crisis
- + Corey Smith – Natural improvement of land use
- + Speaker – Walkability
- + Will Franco – Lots for cars or houses for people
- + Milo Trauss – Long time coming
- + Speaker – Do more than fourplexes
- = Aaron Starr – Response to questions and comments

ACTION: Approved with Staff modifications and the following amendments:

1. That the legislation include a monitoring component;
2. Outreach before and after adoption;
3. Consideration for a different shorthand title; and
4. Legacy Business applications that have not yet been reviewed given consideration.

AYES: Tanner, Chan, Diamond, Fung, Koppel

NAYS: Imperial, Moore

RESOLUTION: [21045](#)

11. [2018-015983CUA](#) (L. HOAGLAND: (628) 652-7320)
136 DELMAR STREET – east side between Frederick and Piedmont Streets; Lot 067A in Assessor’s Block 1270 (District 8) – Request for **Conditional Use Authorization** pursuant to Planning Code Sections 303 and 317, to demolish an existing one-story over basement, single-family dwelling and new construction of a three-story over basement, single-family dwelling and one Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU). The subject property is located within a RH-2 (Residential-House, Two-Family) Zoning District and 40-X Height and Bulk District. This action constitutes the Approval Action for the project for the purposes of CEQA, pursuant to San Francisco Administrative Code Section [31.04](#)(h).
Preliminary Recommendation: Approve with Conditions
 (Continued from Regular hearing on October 21, 2021)

SPEAKERS: = Linda Ajello-Hoagland – Staff report
 + David Armour – Project sponsor
 - Ted Markham – Impact to light and air
 - Ken – Oppose
 + Eric – Support
 + Speaker – Fits in with the neighborhood
 + Amanda – Design fits in with the rest in the block

ACTION: Approved with Conditions and direction to the Sponsor to continue working with Staff on liveability refinements to the ADU.

AYES: Tanner, Chan, Diamond, Fung, Koppel

NAYS: Imperial, Moore

MOTION: [21046](#)

12. [2020-009146CUA](#) (J. HORN: (628) 652-7366)

247 UPPER TERRACE – east side between Clifford Terrace and Upper Terrace (Mt. Olympus Park); Lot 045 in Assessor's Block 2628 (District 8) – Request for **Conditional Use Authorization**, pursuant to Planning Code Sections 249.77 and 303, to demolish an existing 351 square-foot garage structure and to construct a new 4,081 gross-square-foot, four-story-over-basement two-family dwelling, within a RH-2 (Residential-House, Two Family) Zoning District, Corona Heights Large Residence 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

(Continued from Regular hearing on October 28, 2021)

SPEAKERS:

- = Jeff Horn – Staff report
- + David Penn – Project sponsor
- Evelyn Marr – Negative impact to property
- Speaker – Tree
- + Aaron Bailey – Great opportunity to bring more neighbors in the neighborhood
- Carol Glanville – Parking and traffic
- Georgia Schuttish – On behalf of Carol Cox
- Austin Yang – Deputy City Attorney response to questions and comments
- Tess Marks – Does not meet standards

ACTION: Approved with Conditions as amended to include a Tree Protection Plan.

AYES: Tanner, Chan, Diamond, Fung, Koppel

NAYS: Imperial, Moore

MOTION: [21047](#)

13. [2021-010715CRV](#) (N. FOSTER: (628) 652-7330)
1201 SUTTER STREET – south side between Polk Street and Van Ness Avenue; Lot 001 in Assessor's Block 0691 (District 3) – Request for **Commission Review**, pursuant to Planning Code Section 415.5(g)(2), to change the Project's means of compliance with the Inclusionary Affordable Housing Program (Section 415). The Project involves a newly constructed six-story, mixed-use building containing 54 dwelling units located above ground-floor retail. The Project was approved with 51 studios and three (3) two-bedroom units, with eight (8) affordable (or below market rate) units provided on-site. The Project now proposes to change the means of compliance with Section 415, from the On-Site Affordable Housing Alternative to payment of the Affordable Housing Fee. The Project would also convert eight (8) studios to one-bedroom units, resulting in a revised dwelling unit mix of 43 studios, eight (8) one-bedroom units, and three (3) two-bedroom units (still totaling 54 dwelling units). No other changes are proposed to the Project. The Project was issued a Rear Yard Modification Decision on December 11, 2017 (Case No. 2014-001674VAR), and the Planning Department subsequently approved the Project in January of 2018. The proposal to modify the Project's means of compliance with the Inclusionary Affordable Housing Program would not constitute a substantial modification of the Project under the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA"), as defined by San Francisco Administrative Code Section 31.08(i). Therefore, a reevaluation of the Project in accordance with San Francisco Administrative Code Section 31.19, for the purposes of CEQA, is not required.

Preliminary Recommendation: Adopt Findings

SPEAKERS: - Ray – Questioning continuance
 - Margaret – Oppose continuance
 = Nick Foster – Staff report, response to questions and comments
 + Peter Ziblatt – Project sponsor response to questions and comments
 = Austin Yang – Deputy City Attorney response to questions and comments
 - Linda Chapman – Pay fee instead
 - Margaret O’Shea – Lottery
 - Ray – Applied to the lottery
 = Carly Grob – Response to questions and comments

ACTION: After a request to Continue was not adopted and prior to hearing the application was formally Withdrawn and subsequently heard as an informational item.

14. [2021-000215CUA](#) (L. HOAGLAND: (628) 652-7320)
400 HYDE STREET – northeast corner of Ellis Street; Lot 006A in Assessor’s Block 0322 (District 6) – Request for **Conditional Use Authorization**, pursuant to Planning Code Sections 209.3 and 303 to install a new rooftop Macro Wireless Telecommunications Services Facility consisting of the installation of twelve (12) antennas and ancillary equipment as part of the Verizon Wireless Telecommunications Network. The antennas will be screened within 30” diameter FRP vent pipes and the ancillary equipment will be screened behind an 8’ screen wall. The Project site is located within a RC-4 (Residential-Commercial, High Density) Zoning District and 80-T Height and Bulk District. This action constitutes the Approval Action for the project for the purposes of CEQA, pursuant to San Francisco Administrative Code Section [31.04\(h\)](#).

Preliminary Recommendation: Approve with Conditions
 (Continued from Regular hearing on November 4, 2021)

SPEAKERS: = Linda Ajello Hoagland – Staff report
 + Hayden Piper – Project sponsor

ACTION: Approved with Conditions

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

MOTION: [21048](#)

G. DISCRETIONARY REVIEW CALENDAR

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

15. [2021-004141DRP](#) (M. CHRISTENSEN: (628) 652-7567)
2000 OAKDALE AVENUE – northern corner of Oakdale Avenue and Rankin Streets; Lot 051 in Assessor’s Block 5315 (District 10) – Request for **Discretionary Review** of Building Permit No. 2021.0323.7148, which proposes to establish a Cannabis Retail storefront within a PDR-1-B (Production, Distribution, and Repair – 1 - Buffer) Zoning District and 65-J Height and Bulk District. This action constitutes the Approval Action for the project for the purposes of CEQA, pursuant to San Francisco Administrative Code Section [31.04\(h\)](#).
Preliminary Recommendation: Do Not Take Discretionary Review and Approve

SPEAKERS: = Michael Christensen – Staff report
 - Michael Lozeau - DR
 + Tiara Mitchell – Project sponsor
 + Cesar Angobaldo – Project sponsor
 + David Talley – Support
 + Luis Ruvalcava – Support
 + Jeremiah – Support
 + Cristina Sandoval – Support
 + Keshawn – Support
 + Dedria Smith – Support
 + Emily Wayne – Support
 - Mr. Ackerman – DR rebuttal
 + Amber Senter – Project sponsor rebuttal

ACTION: No DR

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

DRA: [765](#)

16. [2017-013947DRP](#) (D. WINSLOW: (628) 652-7335)
310 GREEN STREET – north side between Castle and Montgomery Streets; Lot 015 in Assessor’s Block 0114 (District 3) – Request for **Discretionary Review** of Building Permit 2021.0630.3516 to legalize work performed that exceeded the approved scope of permit (BPA #2017.1020.1807- expired), to relocate a 30” high parapet with a 12” high metal guardrail to enclose an unoccupied portion of the roof at the southwest corner with a third-floor deck of a single-family house within a RM-1 (Residential-Mixed, Low 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 Take Discretionary Review and Approve with Modifications

SPEAKERS: = David Winslow – Staff report
 - Bruno Kanter – DR
 + Peter Ziblatt – Project sponsor
 = Fergal Clancy – DBI response to questions and comments

ACTION: Take DR and Approve with modifications

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

DRA: [766](#)

ADJOURNMENT 6:34 PM
 ADOPTED JANUARY 6, 2022