

# SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING COMMISSION



## Meeting Minutes Remote Hearing via video and teleconferencing

**Thursday, February 24, 2022  
1:00 p.m.  
Regular Meeting**

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

**THE MEETING WAS CALLED TO ORDER BY PRESIDENT TANNER AT 1:03 PM**

**STAFF IN ATTENDANCE:** Aaron Starr, Linda Ajello-Hoagland, Gabriela Pantoja, Kalyani Agnihotri, David Winslow, Liz Watty –Director of Current Planning, 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. 2018-009081ENV (S. GEORGE: (628) 652-7558)  
2055 CHESTNUT STREET – centered within the block bounded by Chestnut Street to the north, Fillmore Street to the east, Lombard Street (U.S. 101) to the south, and Steiner Street to the west in Marina Neighborhood; Lot 009 in Assessor’s Block 0491 (District 2) – **Appeal**

**of Preliminary Negative Declaration** for the proposed demolition the existing building at 2055 Chestnut Street and construction of a three-story, approximately 40-foot-tall (56 feet total, including rooftop mechanical equipment) building containing 49 dwelling units and approximately 36,700 gross square feet (gsf) of retail uses that includes 15,000 gsf of grocery store use, one off-street commercial loading space, and one level of below-grade retail parking for 20 vehicles. The project would include 80 Class 1 off-street bicycle parking spaces, and 16 Class 2 on-street bicycle parking spaces. Approximately 95 feet of curb along the project's Lombard Street frontage would be converted to commercial loading. Approximately 40 feet of curb along the project's Chestnut Street frontage be converted to passenger loading. Construction of the proposed project would involve about 19,500 cubic yards of soil excavation to a depth of about 19 feet below grade. The project site is located in a NC-2 and NC-3 (Neighborhood Commercial, Small Scale, and Moderate Scale) Use Districts and 40-X Height and Bulk District.

*Preliminary Recommendation: Uphold*

**(Proposed for Continuance to March 24, 2022)**

SPEAKERS: None

ACTION: Continued to March 24, 2022

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

2. 2019-015439DRP (D. WINSLOW: (628) 652-7335)  
1937 17<sup>TH</sup> AVENUE – west side between Ortega and Pacheco Streets; Lot 002 in Assessor's Block 2117 (District 7) – Request for **Discretionary Review** of Building Permit No. 2019.0806.7958 to construct a rear horizontal and vertical addition to a two-story, one-family residential building within a RH-1 (Residential House, One-Family) Zoning District and 40-X Height and Bulk District. This action constitutes the Approval Action for the project for the purposes of CEQA, pursuant to San Francisco Administrative Code Section [31.04\(h\)](#).  
*Preliminary Recommendation: Do Not Take Discretionary Review and Approve*  
**(Proposed for Continuance to March 31, 2022)**

SPEAKERS: None

ACTION: Continued to March 31, 2022

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

3. 2016-005365CUA (S. YOUNG: (628) 652-7349)  
230 ANZA STREET – north side between Collin Street and Wood Street; Lot 013 in Assessor's Block 1091 (District 1) – Request for **Conditional Use Authorization** pursuant to Planning Code Sections 209.1, 303 and 317 to allow the tantamount to demolition of an existing 2,094 square-foot two-unit, two-story residential building and to construct a 4,359 square-foot three-unit, three-story residential building (with mezzanine level and decks) 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 December 2, 2021)  
**WITHDRAWN**

SPEAKERS: None

ACTION: Withdrawn

5. [2020-006377CUA](#) (C. CAMPBELL: (628) 652-7387)  
4687 MISSION STREET – southeast side between Persia Street and Brazil Avenue; Lot 021 in Assessor’s Block 6083 (District 11) – Request for **Conditional Use Authorization**, Planning Code Section 202.2, 303 and 720 to establish an 884 square feet Cannabis Retail use within the Excelsior Outer Mission Street NCD (Neighborhood Commercial District) Zoning District and 65-A Height and Bulk District. Project is qualified for the Community Business Priority Processing Program (CB3P). 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: Continued to March 31, 2022

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

14. [2021-004987DRP](#) (D. WINSLOW: (628) 652-7335)  
2760 DIVISADERO STREET – southeast corner of Green Street; Lot 020 in Assessor’s Block 0953 (District 2) – Request for **Discretionary Review** of Building Permit No. 2021.0223.5187 construct an extension of a fourth level rear deck over existing flat roof including new railings to building envelope to a four-story one-family residential building within a RH-1 (Residential House, One-Family) Zoning District and 40-X Height and Bulk District. This action constitutes the Approval Action for the project for the purposes of CEQA, pursuant to San Francisco Administrative Code Section [31.04\(h\)](#).  
*Preliminary Recommendation: Do Not Take Discretionary Review and Approve*  
 (Continued from Regular hearing on January 27, 2022)

SPEAKERS: None

ACTION: Continued to April 14, 2022

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

## 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. [2021-009988CUA](#) (E. WU: (628) 652-7415)  
360 SPEAR STREET – south side between Harrison Street and Folsom Street; Lot 009 of Assessor’s Block 3745 (District 6) – Request for **Conditional Use Authorization**, pursuant to Planning Code Sections 303 and 827, to establish a non-residential use over 25,000 Square feet. Project proposes to convert 34,262 of existing Office and Internet Service Exchange (ISE) Use to Office, Laboratory, and Wholesales Sales Use. No expansion is done. Project is qualified for the Community Business Priority Processing Program (CB3P). This action constitutes the Approval Action for the project for the purposes of CEQA, pursuant to San Francisco Administrative Code Section [31.04\(h\)](#).  
*Preliminary Recommendation: Approve with Conditions*  
 (Continued from Regular hearing on February 17, 2022)

SPEAKERS: None  
 ACTION: Approved with Conditions  
 AYES: Diamond, Fung, Imperial, Koppel, Moore, Tanner  
 MOTION: [21084](#)

6. [2019-014735SHD](#) (L. HOAGLAND: (628) 652-7320)  
600 MCALLISTER STREET – northwest corner of Franklin Street; Lots 0072 & 073 in Assessor's Block 0768 (District 5) – Request for adoption of **Shadow Findings**, pursuant to Planning Code Section 295 that net new shadow from the project would not adversely affect the use of Margaret S. Hayward Playground under the jurisdiction of the Recreation and Park Commission. The project site is located within a NCT-3 (Moderate-Scale Neighborhood Commercial Transit) Zoning District, Market and Octavia Planning Area, and 50-X and 85-X Height and Bulk Districts.  
*The Planning Commission heard and approved 2019-014735CUA (Motion No. 21077) for this item on February 10, 2022, but did not adopt the required shadow findings.*  
*Preliminary Recommendation: Approve with Conditions*

SPEAKERS: None  
 ACTION: Adopted Findings  
 AYES: Diamond, Fung, Imperial, Koppel, Moore, Tanner  
 MOTION: [21080](#)

## C. COMMISSION MATTERS

7. Consideration of Adoption:
- [Draft Minutes for February 3, 2022](#)
  - [Draft Minutes for February 10, 2022](#)

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

8. Commission Comments/Questions

### President Tanner:

I'd like to kick off this session. First, Happy Lunar New Year. It was great to see folks at the parade this last week and other celebrations. So, just a really great time to be with community and just wishing you all end of Black History Month today. So, thanks for indulging me as we have been celebrating throughout the month and hopefully continuing really throughout the year so thank you for that. And I just also wanted to take a moment to express some of my thoughts as we have been getting notice about reopening City Hall and reoccupying City Hall for our Commission hearings. I, personally, am so excited for when we do get to come back in person as the Commissioner who joined you all during the pandemic and have not gotten to be with you all altogether as a group. So, I really am looking forward to that day. At this time, I do have some concerns about coming back in physically to City Hall and being together at this moment. But, I do hope that maybe in the next month or so can get to a point where some of the concerns can both be addressed but also, we can see that the reopening that's happening for the Board of Supervisors, other Commissions, and

other aspects. Just generally of life is hopefully going smoothly, continuing to have cases go down and that some of the factors in my personal life that are making me hesitant to come back may also change and just give me a little bit more confidence that myself and those who I'm caring with and living with will not contract Covid due to me going to the hearings in person. But I just wanted to share that with you all that's kind of where I am and ultimately sharing to members of the public who may be wondering - when are we coming back, what are the hearings going to be like. And so I just want to make an opportunity for those who want to share to also share. I know Commissioner Diamond, you're on the phone. I'm not sure if you able raised your hand or not but I did want to throw it to Commissioner Diamond because I know she's got to leave in a bit. If she'd like to share anything about what she's thinking on this matter or other Commissioner comments that she might have.

**Commissioner Diamond:**

Thank you, Commissioner Tanner. I really appreciate that. I too am very eager to be back especially if the numbers in our community continue to decline the way they have recently. But, I am also concerned about coming back at this point in time, and I believe the staff has done truly a remarkable job in allowing these remote hearings to function pretty well. It is not as great as we were in person, but under the circumstances, I think the remote hearings are working extremely well. Relative to the risk, especially for those of us who are in vulnerable populations or close to or are responsible for taking care of people who are in vulnerable populations or just for those of us who have different risk assessments, which is one thing I have learned during the last 2 years is that each of us judges these circumstances quite differently. And I believe that in the [inaudible] circumstances of the Planning Commission, there are some concerns that I currently have. One, is that we meet in a room which, even in the best of times, has very poor ventilation and certainly has no ability to have the windows be opened. We can meet for 8 to 10 hours at a time, where although the public may, each individual of the public, may not be sitting there the entire time, we the Commissioners certainly are, as are the members of staff. And we don't know the number of participants from the public who will be there. It could be a handful of people but it could be dozens and dozens, maybe up to 100 or more at any particular point in time. We sit very close together and I am quite concerned that under current protocols, there still is an issue out there. And, I guess, I would like to see us exploring some additional mitigating factors that might make some of us feel more comfortable about returning. Do we have to meet in our current room or is it possible to meet in a room where the ventilation is better? While Commissioners and staff need to be fully vaccinated, the public does not and I'm wondering whether or not we are permitted to have the vaccination requirements for those members of the public who wish to attend in person as opposed to remotely during this interim period. Can we hand out N95 or KN95 masks to the public because at the moment the protocols would simply have people wearing cloth masks if that's what they choose. Should we be having capacity limitations in our room together with social distancing? So, I'm hoping that over the next few weeks there can be more conversation about some of these factors. But in the meantime, at least at this point, I am in a vulnerable population and don't feel comfortable returning quite yet. So, thank you.

**Commissioner Imperial:**

Commissioner Diamond, I think you really pointed good points in terms of what our measurements in order to return. Initially, I was actually excited to come back but after thinking about-- thinking it through in terms of access to the Commission by the public and also in terms of the Planning staff as well and also the health risk within our group as well.

And not just for our group, but also with everyone who is going to be involved in here. I think we need to have measurements to count on in order for us to have an in-person meeting. I do not think right now that we have those measurements set in yet. So I am comfortable right now and I think the staff, all of the staff, are doing the best they can and also all of us too it in very pressured moments. It's hard to do these indoor remote hearings, to do the hearings remotely and being at home. However, there is a bigger risk, there are bigger risks too as being played. And it's not just ourselves, but also other people involved. So, that's actually the basis of my decision to also still do the remote hearings because it's more than just [inaudible] it is also all of us that are going to be involved that is also at risk and we need to have protocols and measurements set in place in order for us to decide that. Thank you.

**Commissioner Moore:**

I've given this a lot of thought and while I like bold moves, it is a bold move to in a time when there is uncertainty, I have decided to weigh on the side of caution. There are a number of reasons, many of them were already touched upon and I just want to leave it with that. I will return as soon as possible, and I will continue to dedicate my time and attention to the responsibility of being on the Commission as I have done in the past two years even as virtual and that includes all who have done that. And, I have found the meetings intense and well-attended and thoughtfully conducted so I [inaudible] to everybody who made virtual very well. Thanks.

**Commissioner Koppel:**

I as well wanted to just echo all the comments of the previous speakers. Not only do you see us here virtually on the computers but what you don't see is our immediate friends, family and to some of whom are in close contact with that maybe first responders, nurses. And my father is in an elderly vulnerable population, and I see him sometimes on a daily basis and I would never forgive myself if for whatever reason I, who am fully vaccinated even, was able to get him, who is fully vaccinated, ill for the sake of doing things prematurely when these hearings are being run so successfully. Thanks to all the hard work and effort with the Department and the staff, Jonas and the technology department. So, we do all want to come back as soon as we all feel safe for not just for us, but for members of the public and we should do this at the right time.

**President Tanner:**

I just want to thank you all for sharing all your comments. I don't know, Mr. Secretary, if there are any additional updates regarding returning that you had wanted to update us on that we should be aware of in addition to the communications I think we had last week or two weeks ago.

**Jonas P. Ionin, Commission Secretary:**

Yes, since we are on the topic, I am happy to notify you that the Mayor's Office and the liaison to the Commissions has been in contact with us, as well as, the City Administrator's Office on the improvements that have been made in City Hall related to returning to in-person hearings. We actually met yesterday and were provided a briefing, and I am scheduled to come to City Hall Room 400 on March 1<sup>st</sup>, on Tuesday, in anticipation of returning to in-person hearings to get trained on the new equipment. I personally am curious about the HVAC system and the promise that it has been upgraded. But, for now, that's the only update I have. I appreciate all of your concerns and I share many of them.

**President Tanner:**

Thank you. And the Board will begin meeting in March as well in person. Is that correct?

**Jonas P. Ionin, Commission Secretary:**

You know, I actually, to be honest with you I don't believe the Mayor's mandate impacts the Board. And so, I'm not -- I don't have any indication, I've asked whether or not the Board would be opening up their chambers to members of the public. They have been meeting in person, but it's been restricted to only Supervisors and staff. And as you all know we are all required to be vaccinated. So, there's a much smaller risk related there. Their chambers actually provide appropriate distancing and has very good ventilation. So, I don't know what the timeline is for the Board of Supervisors to open their chambers to members of the public.

**President Tanner:**

Okay. Well, and I think just a reminder to us, I think we have some deadlines to communicate back to you and then I think to communicate our vaccination status that has to update that to DHR I believe. So, just reminder Commissioners to take care of that --

**Jonas P. Ionin, Commission Secretary:**

You all have, actually. Yes, all of the Commissioners have reported their vaccination status.

**President Tanner:**

Perfect. Well done everybody.

**Jonas P. Ionin, Commission Secretary:**

Very good. Hearing that from all of you, we will agendize adoption of a resolution at your March 3<sup>rd</sup> hearing to continue remote hearings.

**D. DEPARTMENT MATTERS****9. Director's Announcements**

None.

**10. 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. Aaron Starr Manager of Legislative Affairs.

At this week's land use hearing, the Committee considered two landmark designations one for the building at One Montgomery and the other for the Diego Rivera mural Allegory of California located at 155 Sansom Street formerly known as the Pacific Stock Exchange Luncheon Club.

- 210898 Planning Code - Landmark Designation - One Montgomery Street (aka 1-25 Montgomery Street) (Crocker National Bank Building). Sponsor: Peskin. Staff: LaValley.

One Montgomery Street, constructed in 1908 with an addition in 1920, is historically significant for its association with the reconstruction of the Financial District following the 1906 Earthquake and Fire. Further, it is architecturally and historically significant as an excellent and well-preserved example of an early twentieth century banking temple in the Italian Renaissance Revival-style. Its ornate and richly detailed interiors exhibit high artistic value and was the work of master architect, Willis Polk, and craftsman, Arthur Putnam.

The HPC recommended approval of the landmark designation on August 4, 2021. At the Land Use hearing SF Heritage spoke in favor of the designation and the committee ultimately recommended approval to the Full Board.

- 220037 Planning Code - Landmark Designation - "Allegory of California," The City Club of San Francisco (formerly Pacific Stock Exchange Luncheon Club), 155 Sansome Street Sponsor: Peskin. Staff: LaValley. Item 2

Allegory of California was recommended for landmark designation by the HPC on November 2, 2021. Allegory of California was created by Diego Rivera between December 1930 and March 1931, at the beginning of Rivera's first visit to San Francisco and was Rivera's first fresco in the United States. Allegory is culturally and historically significant for its association with preeminent Mexican artist Diego Rivera. The first fresco painted by Rivera in the United States is also significant for its influence on the New Deal-era Works Project Administration mural program and the muralism movement of the 1960s and 1970s. The fresco is also significant for association with the Latinx and Chicanx arts communities, a significant and vibrant part of San Francisco's cultural heritage.

At the land use hearing this week SF Heritage and SF Latino Historical Society spoke in support of designation. Supervisor Melgar also spoke to how important this fresco is to the Latino community. Prior to voting on the item, Sups Melgar, Preston, and Mandelman joined as co-sponsors. LUT recommended approval to the Full Board.

- 211236 Planning Code - Massage Establishment Zoning Controls. Sponsors: Mandelman; Ronen and Preston. Staff: V. Flores

Next the Committee considered Supervisor Mandelman's ordinance that would allow Massage as an Accessory use to Health Services. As you recall this was amended at the previous hearing to include changes to the NC-2 zoning table and then continued for one week. At the hearing, Supervisor Mandelman made opening remarks and reiterated the drafting error for NC-2 zoning district.

Chair Melgar then duplicated file to introduce amendments to Ocean Ave NCT, which had very specific parameters due to a history of illicit activity in the Ocean Ave NCT. Supervisor Melgar's amendments were not discussed at the Planning Commission hearing so re-referral is required.

There were only two commentors; one in cautious support and the other who sought for more relaxation of the rules around Massage uses.



The Committee then voted to forward the item to the Full Board, and also to duplicate the file with Supervisor Melgar's amendments. So, this commission will once again hear an ordinance dealing with massage uses in the near future.

- 210116 Planning Code, Zoning Map - Central Neighborhoods Large Residence Special Use District. Sponsor: Mandelman. Staff: Merlone. Item 5

Next, the Land Use Committee heard the substituted version of Supervisor Mandelman's Large Home Legislation. Commissioners, you heard this item on September 23, 2021, and recommended disapproval.

- The Supervisor did revise his proposed ordinance based on comments he heard from the Commission hearing. The new ordinance:
  - Reduces the affected area of the SUD to District 8.
  - Increases the CUA trigger to 3,000sqft, or a 1.2 FAR
  - Increases the expansion allowance for dwelling units already over the maximum from 10% to 15% over the course of 10 years AND
  - Revised the grandfathering clause to apply to applications submitted on or before January 1st, 2022

After some generally favorable public comment, the Land Use Committee voted unanimously to move the ordinance to the full board with a positive recommendation.

## FULL BOARD

- 220031 Hearing - Appeal of Determination of Exemption From Environmental Review - Proposed 2000 Oakdale Avenue Project. Staff: Bihl.

Continued to March 1, 2022

## Introductions

Supervisor Walton also introduced interim controls for 18 months that would require Conditional Use authorization for all Parcel Delivery Service uses. Since this is an interim control, it will not come too you for a recommendation. The item needs to sit for 30 days and then will have to go to the Land Use Committee and then to the Full Board for one vote since it is a Resolution. If not vetoed by the mayor, it would take effect 10 days after the Board signs it.

## E. GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT

**SPEAKERS:** Sues Hestor – Discussion regarding virtual meetings  
 Georgia Schuttish – Please review CPC Docket 06.0070 ET Noe Valley: The epicenter for De Facto Demolition according to the Staff. And if one thinks about an epicenter, reverberations ripple out from the epicenter. One Example: Original pair of Flats and original SFH in photos shown during General Public Comment. Both are Spec Projects. During work on Flats, scope of work exceeded and determined to be TTD. If the Calcs had been adjusted, Flats could have been preserved and could be occupied now.

During the work on the SFH the Calcs were revised. They were very close to the thresholds. If the Calcs had been adjusted, SFH could have been a simple Alteration, not high-end, high-priced, Spec project. In Section 317 (b)(2)(D) adjusting the Calcs by reducing the values, is not counting pieces of wood. Rather it is preserving housing: Allowing for reasonable Alterations per Code and General Plan.

## F. REGULAR CALENDAR

The Commission Hearing Procedures provide for presentations by staff; when applicable, followed by a presentation of the project sponsor team; followed by public comment. Please be advised that the project sponsor team includes: the sponsor(s) or their designee, lawyers, architects, engineers, expeditors, and/or other advisors.

- 11a. [2018-014727SHD](#) (L. HOAGLAND: (628) 652-7320)  
921 O'FARRELL STREET – south side of O'Farrell Street and north side of Olive Street, between Polk Street and Van Ness Avenue; Lot 020 in Assessor's Block 0718 (District 6) – Request for adoption of **Shadow Findings**, pursuant to Planning Code Section 295 that net new shadow from the project would not adversely affect the use of Sergeant John MaCaulay Park under the jurisdiction of the Recreation and Park Commission, located within a RC-4 (Residential-Commercial, High-Density) Zoning District, Van Ness SUD (Special Use District), Van Ness Corridor Area Plan Area, and 130-V Height and Bulk District.

*Preliminary Recommendation: Approve with Conditions*

SPEAKERS: = Linda Ajello-Hoagland – Staff Report  
 + David Baker – Project Sponsor Presentation  
 + Jim Chappell – What the city needs  
 + Corey Smith – Density, parking and access to alternative public transportation  
 + Robert Fruchtman – Minimal shadow impact  
 + Speaker – BMR and family size housing, parking free residence

ACTION: Adopted Findings

AYES: Fung, Imperial, Koppel, Moore, Tanner

ABSENT: Diamond

MOTION: [21081](#)

- 11b. [2018-014727AHB](#) (L. HOAGLAND: (628) 652-7320)  
921 O'FARRELL STREET – south side of O'Farrell Street and north side of Olive Street, between Polk Street and Van Ness Avenue; Lot 020 in Assessor's Block 0718 (District 6) – Request for **HOME-SF Project Authorization**, pursuant to Planning Code Sections 206.3, 295 and 328, to allow the demolition of an existing approximately 4,500 gross square foot, two-story, commercial building, and new construction of a 63,479 gross square foot, fourteen-story-over-basement, 140-foot -tall, 50 dwelling unit mixed-use building with approximately 801 square feet of retail space on the ground floor. The Project would include approximately 689 square feet of usable open space on a common roof deck and 1,977 square feet of private open space via twenty-seven private decks, 50 Class 1 bicycle parking spaces located at the basement level, and two Class 2 spaces on the sidewalk adjacent to the project site, located within a RC-4 (Residential-Commercial, High-Density) Zoning District, Van Ness SUD (Special Use District), Van Ness Corridor Area Plan Area, 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*

SPEAKERS: Same as item 11a.  
 ACTION: Approved with Conditions  
 AYES: Fung, Imperial, Koppel, Moore, Tanner  
 ABSENT: Diamond  
 MOTION: [21082](#)

- 12a. [2017-001961SHD](#) (G. PANTOJA: (628) 652-7380)  
350 OCEAN AVENUE – north side between San Jose and Delano Avenues; Lot 023 in Assessor’s Block 3212 (District 11) – Request for adoption of **Shadow Findings** pursuant to Planning Code Section 295 that net new shadow from the project would not adversely affect the use of Balboa Park under the jurisdiction of the Recreation and Park Commission, within a NCT-1 (Neighborhood Commercial Transit Cluster) and 45-X Height and Bulk District.  
*Preliminary Recommendation: Approve with Conditions*

SPEAKERS: = Gabriela Pantoja – Staff Report  
 + Jeremy Schaub – Project Sponsor Presentation  
 - Ernesto Fabela – Ramifications and safety measures  
 - David Hooper – Ground floor apartment street access  
 - Speaker – Need more time to discuss  
 + Robert Fruchtman – Support  
 = Austin Yang – City attorney  
 ACTION: After hearing and closing public comment; Continued to April 14, 2022  
 AYES: Imperial, Koppel, Moore  
 NAYS: Fung, Tanner  
 ABSENT: Diamond

- 12b. [2017-001961CUA](#) (G. PANTOJA: (628) 652-7380)  
350 OCEAN AVENUE – north side between San Jose and Delano Avenues; Lot 023 in Assessor’s Block 3212 (District 11) – Request for **Conditional Use Authorization** pursuant to Planning Code Sections 121.1, 303, 750 and for a Concession/Incentive and Waiver from Development Standards, pursuant to Planning Code Section 206.6 and California Government Code Section 65915 under State Density Bonus Law, to allow the demolition of two existing one-story, commercial buildings and the construction of a five-story over basement, 35 dwelling unit (18 two-bedrooms, 13 one bedroom, and four studios) residential building with 15 off-street parking spaces, 36 Class 1 bicycle parking spaces, two Class 2 bicycle parking spaces, 561 square feet of private usable open space, and 3,888 square feet of common usable open space within a NCT-1 (Neighborhood Commercial Transit Cluster) and 45-X Height and Bulk District. Under the **Individually-Requested State Density Bonus Program**, the Project seeks a density bonus, a concession/incentive from Usable Open Space (Section 135), and waivers from Rear Yard (Section 134), Exposure (140), and Height (Section 260) requirements. This action constitutes the Approval Action for the project for the purposes of CEQA, pursuant to San Francisco Administrative Code Section [31.04\(h\)](#).  
*Preliminary Recommendation: Approve with Conditions*

SPEAKERS: Same as item 12a.  
 ACTION: After hearing and closing public comment; Continued to April 14, 2022  
 AYES: Imperial, Koppel, Moore  
 NAYS: Fung, Tanner  
 ABSENT: Diamond

13. [2021-008810CUA](#) (K. AGNIHOTRI: (628) 652-7454)  
1520 LYON STREET – east side between Bush and Sutter Streets; Lot 035 in Assessor's Block 1054 (District 2) – Request for **Conditional Use Authorization** pursuant to Planning Code Sections 209.1, and 303 to amend the prior Conditional Use Authorization (1994.585C) to eliminate the previously approved conditions in order to operate as a principally permitted use, as allowed under the current Planning Code. The project does not propose any changes to the existing building on site. The project is located within a RH-2 (Residential – House, Two Family) and RH-3 (Residential – House, Three Family) Zoning Districts 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 January 20, 2022)

SPEAKERS: = Kalyani Agnihotri – Staff Report  
 + Kaile Thomas – Project Sponsor  
 + Brandi Hudson – Support  
 + Andrew - Support  
 + Anne Irwin – Support  
 + Stephanie Jensen – Support  
 + Natasha – Support  
 + Hillary – Support  
 + Cathy – Support  
 + Kelsey Baltazar – Support  
 + Erin Keith – Support  
 + Bailey McKenna – Support  
 + Samantha Carroll – Support  
 + Jonathan Kelly – Support  
 + Laura Zellerbach – Support

ACTION: Approved with Conditions  
 AYES: Diamond, Fung, Imperial, Koppel, Moore, Tanner  
 MOTION: 21083

## 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. [2021-004075DRP](#) (D. WINSLOW: (628) 652-7335)  
2454-2456 FRANCISCO STREET – north side between Baker and Broderick Streets; Lot 016 in Assessor's Block 0926 (District 2) – Request for **Discretionary Review** of Building Permit No.

2021.0316.6642 to construct a vertical addition and make facade alterations. The project also proposes to reestablish the second dwelling unit illegally merged by removing the internal stair connecting the first and second floors to a three-story, two-family residential building 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: Do Not Take Discretionary Review and Approve*

SPEAKERS: = David Winslow – Staff Report  
- Deborah Holley – DR Requestor  
+ Tom Tunney – Project Sponsor

ACTION: Took DR and Approved with Modifications agreed upon by both parties.

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

DRA: [773](#)

ADJOURNMENT 3:13 PM

ADOPTED MARCH 24, 2022