

MAR 29 2018

BEFORE THE SAN FRANCISCO BOARD OF APPEALS

This appeal, given the subject matter, is not meant to be confrontational or disrespectful to anyone's belief, feelings or convictions, but rather is motivated out of the belief, backed by law and custom, that we as a society 1) should adhere to rule of law, 2) should have intellectual integrity and 3) should be cognizant that dislike or distaste for something does not permit its destruction or denial. For example, we do not burn books (think Nazi Germany) because they are disfavored, nor do we destroy statues (think Taliban destruction of Buddha Statues in Afghanistan). I would also add a cliché - not to know history, is to repeat history.

I believe that it is for these reasons that there has long been a recognition in this country of historic preservation. There would be very little to preserve if preservation was premised on subjective standards - one can always find a relatively significant segment of society that would find almost anything not to be worthy of preservation. It is for this reason that objective standards have been established for determination of what is to be preserved.

1 To that end, preservation and of applying objective criteria, the San Francisco Planning
2 Department has a Historic Preservation Commission (HPC). The word "preservation" must be
3 emphasized here: preservation is the antithesis of destruction. Here, the HPC acted not to
4 preserve the historic 1894 Pioneer Monument (which withstood the 1906 earthquake), but to
5 destroy or alter in such a meaningful and substantive manner so as to constitute its "constructive"
6 destruction. "Constructive" as just used is in the legal sense where the law deems the destruction
7 to have occurred by the surrounding facts, conduct, circumstances and/or instrumentality. Here,
8 banishing the "Early Day" portion of the Monument to "storage" has the very same effect as to
9 destroy it, indeed that is the desired effect of its proposed removal.
10
11

12
13 **THE COMMISSION COULD NOT ACT ON THE REQUEST FOR A CERTIFICATE**
14 **OF APPROPRIATENESS BECAUSE THE REQUESTER OF THE CERTIFICATE HAD**
15 **NO STANDING/AUTHORITY TO MAKE THE REQUEST**

16 The application for the Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) does not identify the
17 applicants name.¹ It is signed by "Tom DeCaigny, Director of Cultural Affairs, indicating
18 (incorrectly) he is the "owner." Despite such ambiguities, taken in whole, it is clear the applicant
19 was the San Francisco Arts Commission.
20

21 To determine the San Francisco Arts Commission standing to make such a request, one
22 must look at its authority to act. First, it is indisputable that the Pioneer Monument was donated
23 to the City and County of San Francisco and it was officially accepted by the City and County in
24 1894. Thus, the City and County is the owner of the Monument. Accordingly, the only way the
25
26
27

28 ¹ In order to save trees, the Board is requested to take administrative notice of the HPC's
voluminous file underlying the subject matter which is available on the internet at HPC's website.

1 Arts Commission could submit an application is if it was lawfully acting as an agent on behalf of
2 the City and County.

3 The Arts Commission is established by section 5.103 of the City's Charter. That section
4 authorizes the Art Commission to promote and encourage the arts; absolutely nothing in the
5 Charter remotely empowers the Arts Commission to destroy or otherwise remove, alter or
6 destroy pieces of art. Indeed, it is expressly against California law to destroy or alter art. Civil
7 Code §987(c)(1) provides:
8

9
10 "No person, except an artist who owns and possesses a
11 work of fine art which the artist has created, shall intentionally
12 commit, or authorize the intentional commission of, any physical
13 defacement, mutilation, alteration, or destruction of a work of fine art."
14

15 In short, the Arts Commission has no authority, and thus no standing, to seek the COA
16 from the Historical Preservation Commission (HPC). Indeed the attempt to obtain the COA was
17 an ultra vires act in violation of California law. Civil Code §987(c)(1).
18

19 **EVEN IF THE STANDING ISSUE IS OVERCOME, THE HISTORIC PRESERVATION**
20 **COMMISSION CATEGORICALLY ERRED IN ISSUING THE CERTIFICATE**

21 As noted above, Civil Code §987(c)(1) forbids destruction or alteration of art.
22 Unquestionably, the HPC authorization of the COA serves "to authorize the intentional
23 commission of alteration, or destruction of a work of fine art." (Civil Code §987(c)(1)).
24 The fine art was the creation of a historically recognized artist, Frank H. Happersberger. It has
25 always been conceded that the Pioneer Monument is a work of fine art. Removal of the Early
26 Days component of the Pioneer Monument is beyond doubt an alteration of the piece of art. In
27
28

1 addition, it will result in the destruction of the work of art by removal (and hiding in storage) of a
2 key component of the art piece. Further, the proposed removal of the Early Days also serves to
3 physically "deface" and "mutilate" the works of art (the Pioneer Movement and the Early Day
4 component).

5
6
7 **THE ISSUANCE OF THE COA WAS PREMISED ON INCONTROVERTIBLE**
8 **MISREPRESENTATIONS OF FACTS AND WAS ARBITRARY AND**
9 **CAPRICIOUS²**

10 The COA wrongly concluded removal of "Early Days" to an unknown storage location
11 adequately preserves it. This misses the point: The issue here is the preservation of the whole
12 Pioneer Monument, not its disassembly and the "preservation" of it in a piecemeal fashion. As
13 noted above, secreting part of the Monument to unknown storage location is tantamount to the
14 destruction of Early Days - its presence for human perception is destroyed by hiding it.

15 Under its "Findings," the HPC wrongly concluded the removal of Early Days would not
16 materially alter the character defining features or spatial relationship of the landmark district.
17 How a monument that has stood for 120 plus years as a center piece in the Civic Center
18 Historical District is not a defining feature is simply incredible and not supported by any
19 evidence. It is the oldest, and most historic (literally and also in the sense of telling history) part
20 of the Civic Center. It pre-dates City Hall by years. It survived the 1906 earthquake, one of the
21 worst calamity to hit San Francisco. Its spatial relationship to the district is also incontrovertible.
22 Removal of the Early Day element from the Pioneer Monument is to remove the complete sense
23
24
25
26
27

28 ² See attached hereto the subject Motion No. 0331 of February 21, 2018 with its Preamble, Conditions of Approval, Findings and Decision.

1 of balance and symmetry of the Monument and the imagery one has looking from United
2 Nations Plaza west towards City Hall.

3 The HPC wrongly concluded "historic features" would be retained. This is Orwellian.
4 How does one maintain a historic feature by taking and hiding it from the public? Historically,
5 the Monument has at all times had the Early Days element, and its removal and secretion is not
6 retention, but destruction of a historic feature.
7

8 The HPC wrongly found the project would not add "any conjectural historical features or
9 features that lend a false sense of historical development." This is belied by the fact that the very
10 (political/cultural³) reason for the removal of Early Days is meant to present a false sense of the
11 Monument and the historic mentality at the time of its dedication and acceptance by the City. In
12 addition, the HPC wants to add a "conjectural historic feature" by requiring under "Conditions of
13 Approval" an undefined plaque. The "plaque shall be installed at the site of the Early Days
14 sculpture to explain its removal." Conjecture is necessary to speculate as to the wording and the
15 form of the plaque. Is it going to include dissenting opinions? One can only imagine the chaos of
16 negotiating the language of this conjectural plaque.
17
18

19 The HPC wrongly found the project would "retain" the character-defining monumental
20 scale and axial plan of the Civic Center Landmark District. The facts are to the contrary. As
21 noted above the symmetry and balance of the Monument would be grossly destroyed, as would
22 its axial alignment with City Hall. The HPC's conclusion is simply in defiance of visual reality.
23
24
25
26

27 ³I don't dispute there are numerous legitimate cultural and political issues sincerely held regarding
28 Early Days. My premise is that their existence does not serve as a proper legal basis to alter the
Monument and remove and hide Early Days. It should be noted that there is already a very
prominent plaque in front of Early Days which articulates objections to its presence.

1 Finally, the HPC wrongly found compliance with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards.

2 Standard 1: the property's historic purpose is being saliently changed by a
3 politically/culturally motivated alteration of the property's use.

4 Standard 2: The historic character of the property is being materially altered and the
5 artist's artistic expression and depiction⁴ of the times is being destroyed by the removal and
6 hiding from public view of an essential element of the property and the Pioneer monument.
7

8 Standard 3: As noted above, the removal and secretion of Early Days will serve and is
9 meant to create a false sense of historical development and add a false sense of what the
10 Monument expressed and depicted.

11 Standard 5: Obviously, removal of Early Days materially alters distinctive features or
12 examples of craftsmanship and construction techniques of the property.
13

14 Standard 8: The whole Pioneer Monument is in and of itself an archeological resource
15 which the removal of Early Days alters/defaces - and its removal is certainly not an act of
16 protection or preservation of the archeological significance of the monument.
17

18 Standard 9: As discussed above, removal of Early Days is an "exterior alteration" that
19 destroys historic features that characterize the property.
20

21 **THE HPC PURPOSE IS TO PROTECT HISTORIC ELEMENTS OF SAN FRANCISCO**
22 **NOT DESTROY OR MATERIALLY ALTER THEM**

23 The HPC went off of this chartered mission: preservation. There are no concoctions of
24 words or facts that can cover the reality of the subject COA: material alteration and destruction
25
26

27
28 ⁴ All art is necessarily a product of its time, and may seem out of place with contemporary morals and thoughts, but it is for this very reason art is deemed worthy of preservation since it is truly a human expression form meant to span time no less that written books or films.

1 of the oldest element of the Civic Center Historic District. Intellectual honesty cannot allow the
2 HPC to abuse and ignore its purpose by allowing the COA to issue, contrary to all facts and
3 objective standards. Moreover, the HPC did not even consider or review the James Lick trust,
4 which bequeathed the Monument to the City to determine its terms and conditions or any
5 reversionary interest that might result from the COA.
6

7 **THE COA WILL SERVE TO VIOLATE THE FIRST AMENDMENT AND**
8 **CORRESPONDING CALIFORNIA CONSTITUTIONAL PROTECTIONS**

9 The COA runs afoul of the First Amendment by discriminating in favor of some
10 expression over others. This is self evident from the removal of Early Days, and the expression
11 represented thereby, but leaves in place the other expressions represented by the remaining
12 features of the Monument. See generally Hopper v. City of Pasco (9th Cir. 2001) 241 F. 3d 1068.
13 In addition, the condition of removal of Early Days, i.e. the placement of a plaque explaining its
14 removal, manifestly involves a discriminatory selection of some speech/expression over other
15 speech/expression.
16

17 In sum, the COA violates the First Amendment and the corresponding California
18 Constitutional guarantees.
19

20
21 **AT THE VERY LEAST AN EIR UNDER CEQA IS FIRST REQUIRED AS THE**
22 **MONUMENT IS A PUBLIC RESOURCE**

23 As the Pioneer Monument is on in the National Historic District Registry and the
24 California Registry as well, the Monument is thus conclusively an "historic resource" under
25 Public Resource Code §5024.1(g) for CEQA purposes. Once a property is an "historical
26 resource," it must be determined if the proposed project could cause a substantial adverse change
27 in the significance of the historical resource. CEQA defines a "substantial adverse change" as the
28

1 physical demolition, destruction, relocation or alteration of the historical resource or its
2 immediate surroundings such that the significance of an historical resource would be "materially
3 impaired." CEQA defines "materially impaired" as work that materially alters, in an adverse
4 manner, those physical characteristics that convey the resources historical significance and
5 justify its inclusion in the California Registry of Historic Places. See generally 14 CCR
6 §15064.5.
7

8 Here, there is undoubtedly such an adverse effect, such that at the very least an
9 Environmental Impact Statement was absolutely necessary prior to the consideration of the COA
10 as its issuance is not exempt under CEQA.
11

12 CONCLUSION

13
14 Art is well recognized as a form of freedom of expression. Therefore, even if distasteful or
15 offensive, it must be protected and preserved. Here, the subject work of art already has planted at
16 its base a commentary disavowing some of imagery imparted. The Pioneer Monument cannot
17 lawfully be altered as such would violate the applicable historic preservation standards, Civil
18 Code §987, the First Amendment to the U.S. Constitution and Freedom of Expression protected
19 by the California Constitution. And, in addition, it is just plain bad public policy. Finally, at the
20 very least, an EIR is necessary prior to even considering the issuance of a COA.
21

22 For the foregoing reasons, the COA's issuance was factually and legally wrong and in
23 wholly at odds with historic preservation and ideals of freedom of artistic expression and must be
24 reversed.
25

26 Dated: March 29, 2018

27 Respectfully submitted,

28 
Frear Stephen Schmid

MAR 19 2018

APPEAL # 18-035

SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Historic Preservation Commission Motion No. 0331

HEARING DATE: FEBRUARY 21, 2018

1650 Mission St.
Suite 400
San Francisco,
CA 94103-2479

Reception:
415.558.6378

Fax:
415.558.6409

Planning
Information:
415.558.6377

Case No.: 2017-015491COA
Project Address: **Fulton Street Right-Of-Way**
Historic Landmark: Civic Center Landmark District
Zoning: P (Public)
80-X Height and Bulk District
Block/Lot: Between Blocks 0353 and 0354
Applicant: Allison Cummings
San Francisco Arts Commission
401 Van Ness Ave., Suite 325
San Francisco, CA 94102
allison.cummings@sfgov.org
Staff Contact: Eiliesh Tuffy - (415) 575-9191
eiliesh.tuffy@sfgov.org
Reviewed By: Tim Frye - (415) 575-6822
tim.frye@sfgov.org

ADOPTING FINDINGS FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS FOR PROPOSED WORK DETERMINED TO BE APPROPRIATE FOR AND CONSISTENT WITH THE PURPOSES OF ARTICLE 10, TO MEET THE STANDARDS OF ARTICLE 10 AND TO MEET THE SECRETARY OF INTERIOR'S STANDARDS FOR REHABILITATION, FOR THE PROPERTY LOCATED ON LOTS 031-034 IN ASSESSOR'S BLOCK 0524, WITHIN AN RH-2 (RESIDENTIAL, HOUSE, TWO-FAMILY) ZONING DISTRICT AND A 40-X HEIGHT AND BULK DISTRICT.

PREAMBLE

WHEREAS, on December 5, 2017, Allison Cummings with the San Francisco Arts Commission (Project Sponsor) filed an application with the San Francisco Planning Department (hereinafter "Department") for a Certificate of Appropriateness to alter a small scale character-defining feature in the Civic Center Landmark District by removing to storage the bronze "Early Days" sculptural group from the (James Lick) Pioneer Monument. The subject property is located within the Fulton Street right-of-way, between Block 0353 and Block 0354. The work includes:

- Removal of the "Early Days" bronze sculptural grouping, which is one out of five existing bronze sculptures on the Pioneer Monument. The sculpture will be removed and prepared for storage by conservation professionals. Storage will occur at an off-site location that provides adequate protection of the sculpture from physical and environmental damage or deterioration.

- Repair and patching of abandoned anchor points at the “early Days” granite base, to be executed using the gentlest cleaning methods necessary and historically appropriate patching materials so as not to cause of further any damage or deterioration to the historic stone.

WHEREAS, the Project was determined by the Department to be categorically exempt from environmental review. The Historic Preservation Commission (hereinafter “Commission”) has reviewed and concurs with said determination.

WHEREAS, on February 21, 2018, the Commission conducted a duly noticed public hearing on the current project, Case No. 2017-015491COA (“Project”) for its appropriateness.

WHEREAS, in reviewing the Application, the Commission has had available for its review and consideration case reports, plans, and other materials pertaining to the Project contained in the Department’s case files, has reviewed and heard testimony and received materials from interested parties during the public hearing on the Project.

MOVED, that the Commission hereby grants with Conditions of Approval the Certificate of Appropriateness, in conformance with the application materials dated received December 5, 2018 and labeled Exhibit A on file in the docket for Case No. 2017-015491COA based on the following findings:

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

- Upon completion of the Project, any documentation (photographs, written documentation, specifications for granite repair, etc.) that is completed as part of the removal and storage of the “Early Days” sculpture should be forwarded to the Planning Department to be added to the administrative record for Case No. 2017-015491COA.
- A plaque shall be installed at the site of the Early Days sculpture to explain its removal.

FINDINGS

Having reviewed all the materials identified in the recitals above and having heard oral testimony and arguments, this Commission finds, concludes, and determines as follows:

1. The above recitals are accurate and also constitute findings of the Commission.
2. Findings pursuant to Article 10:

The Historical Preservation Commission has determined that the proposed work is compatible with the character of the landmark district as described in the designation report as amended to February 10, 1994.

- While this project would cause a reduction in the number of bronze sculptural figures on public display as part of the Pioneer Monument, it would not materially alter the character defining features or spatial relationships of the landmark district.

- Historic features, materials and finishes dating from the district's period of significance would be retained and severely deteriorated materials would be replaced with features matching the original in terms of design, details, material composition, color, and finish. The work would also be monitored by qualified art conservationists to ensure compliance with historic preservation standards.
- The proposed project would not add any conjectural historical features or features that lend a false sense of historical development to the landmark district.
- If the proposed work were to be reversed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the site and surrounding district would remain intact.
- The project would retain the character-defining monumental scale and axial plan of the Civic Center Landmark District.
- The proposed project meets the following Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation:

Standard 1.

A property shall be used for its historic purpose or be placed in a new use that requires minimal change to the defining characteristics of the building and its site and environment.

Standard 2.

The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of historic materials or alteration of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided.

Standard 3.

Each property will be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or elements from other historic properties, will not be undertaken.

Standard 5.

Distinctive features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property shall be preserved.

Standard 6.

Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.

Standard 7.

Chemical or physical treatments, if appropriate, will be undertaken using the gentlest means possible. Treatments that cause damage to historic materials will not be used.

Standard 8.

Significant archeological resources affected by a project shall be protected and preserved. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures shall be undertaken.

Standard 9.

New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work will be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.

Standard 10.

New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.

3. **General Plan Compliance.** The proposed Certificate of Appropriateness is, on balance, consistent with the following Objectives and Policies of the General Plan:

I. URBAN DESIGN ELEMENT

THE URBAN DESIGN ELEMENT CONCERNS THE PHYSICAL CHARACTER AND ORDER OF THE CITY, AND THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PEOPLE AND THEIR ENVIRONMENT.

GOALS

The Urban Design Element is concerned both with development and with preservation. It is a concerted effort to recognize the positive attributes of the city, to enhance and conserve those attributes, and to improve the living environment where it is less than satisfactory. The Plan is a definition of quality, a definition based upon human needs.

OBJECTIVE 1

EMPHASIS OF THE CHARACTERISTIC PATTERN WHICH GIVES TO THE CITY AND ITS NEIGHBORHOODS AN IMAGE, A SENSE OF PURPOSE, AND A MEANS OF ORIENTATION.

POLICY 1.3

Recognize that buildings, when seen together, produce a total effect that characterizes the city and its districts.

OBJECTIVE 2

CONSERVATION OF RESOURCES WHICH PROVIDE A SENSE OF NATURE, CONTINUITY WITH THE PAST, AND FREEDOM FROM OVERCROWDING.

POLICY 2.4

Preserve notable landmarks and areas of historic, architectural or aesthetic value, and promote the preservation of other buildings and features that provide continuity with past development.

POLICY 2.5

Use care in remodeling of older buildings, in order to enhance rather than weaken the original character of such buildings.

POLICY 2.7

Recognize and protect outstanding and unique areas that contribute in an extraordinary degree to San Francisco's visual form and character.

The goal of a Certificate of Appropriateness is to provide additional oversight for buildings and districts that are architecturally or culturally significant to the City in order to protect the qualities that are associated with that significance.

The proposed project qualifies for a Certificate of Appropriateness and therefore furthers these policies and objectives by maintaining and preserving the character-defining features of the 1338 Filbert Street Cottages for the future enjoyment and education of San Francisco residents and visitors.

4. The proposed project is generally consistent with the eight General Plan priority policies set forth in Section 101.1 in that:

- A) The existing neighborhood-serving retail uses will be preserved and enhanced and future opportunities for resident employment in and ownership of such businesses will be enhanced:

The proposed project will not have any impact on neighborhood serving retail uses.

- B) The existing housing and neighborhood character will be conserved and protected in order to preserve the cultural and economic diversity of our neighborhoods:

The proposed project will strengthen neighborhood character by respecting the character-defining features of the landmark district in conformance with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards.

- C) The City's supply of affordable housing will be preserved and enhanced:

The project will not reduce the affordable housing supply.

- D) The commuter traffic will not impede MUNI transit service or overburden our streets or neighborhood parking:

The proposed project will not result in commuter traffic impeding MUNI transit service or overburdening the streets or neighborhood parking.

- E) A diverse economic base will be maintained by protecting our industrial and service sectors from displacement due to commercial office development. And future opportunities for resident employment and ownership in these sectors will be enhanced:

The proposed will not have any impact on industrial and service sector jobs.

- F) The City will achieve the greatest possible preparedness to protect against injury and loss of life in an earthquake.

Preparedness against injury and loss of life in an earthquake is improved by the proposed work. All work on site will be executed in compliance with all applicable construction and safety measures.

- G) That landmark and historic buildings will be preserved:

The proposed project is in conformance with Article 10 of the Planning Code and the Secretary of the Interior's Standards.

- H) Parks and open space and their access to sunlight and vistas will be protected from development:

The proposed project will not impact the access to sunlight or vistas for the parks and open space.

5. For these reasons, the proposal overall, is appropriate for and consistent with the purposes of Article 10, meets the standards of Article 10, and the Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation, General Plan and Prop M findings of the Planning Code.

DECISION

That based upon the Record, the submissions by the Applicant, the staff of the Department and other interested parties, the oral testimony presented to this Commission at the public hearings, and all other written materials submitted by all parties, the Commission hereby **APPROVES a Certificate of Appropriateness** for the Pioneer Monument located in the Fulton Street right-of-way between Assessor's Block 0353 and Block 0354 for proposed work in conformance with the application materials dated as received December 5, 2017 and labeled Exhibit A on file in the docket for Case No. 2017-015491COA.

APPEAL AND EFFECTIVE DATE OF MOTION: The Commission's decision on a Certificate of Appropriateness shall be final unless appealed within thirty (30) days. Any appeal shall be made to the Board of Appeals, unless the proposed project requires Board of Supervisors approval or is appealed to the Board of Supervisors as a conditional use, in which case any appeal shall be made to the Board of Supervisors (see Charter Section 4.135).

Duration of this Certificate of Appropriateness: This Certificate of Appropriateness is issued pursuant to Article 10 of the Planning Code and is valid for a period of three (3) years from the effective date of approval by the Historic Preservation Commission. The authorization and right vested by virtue of this action shall be deemed void and canceled if, within 3 years of the date of this Motion, a site permit or building permit for the Project has not been secured by Project Sponsor.

THIS IS NOT A PERMIT TO COMMENCE ANY WORK OR CHANGE OF OCCUPANCY UNLESS NO BUILDING PERMIT IS REQUIRED. PERMITS FROM THE DEPARTMENT OF BUILDING INSPECTION (and any other appropriate agencies) MUST BE SECURED BEFORE WORK IS STARTED OR OCCUPANCY IS CHANGED.

I hereby certify that the Historical Preservation Commission ADOPTED the foregoing Motion on February 21, 2018.

Jonas P. Ionin
Commission Secretary

AYES: Wolfram, Hyland, Johnck, Johns, Pearlman, Matsuda

NAYS: None

ABSENT: None

ADOPTED: February 21, 2018

1
2 **CERTIFICATE OF DELIVERY**
3

4 I certify I delivered true and correct copies of the attached brief with the exhibit on March
5 29, 2018 before 5:00 P.M. to the following interested parties:
6

7
8 San Francisco Arts Commission
9 401 Van Ness Ave, #325
10 San Francisco, CA 94102

11 San Francisco Historic Commission
12 1650 Mission Street, #400
13 San Francisco, CA 94103

14 Dated: March 29, 2018
15

16 
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
Frear Stephen Schmid

From: [Secretary, Commissions \(CPC\)](#)
To: [Ikezo, Paolo \(CPC\)](#); [Son, Chanbory \(CPC\)](#); [Feliciano, Josephine \(CPC\)](#)
Subject: FW: STRONGLY OPPOSING SB 828 and SB 827
Date: Wednesday, April 04, 2018 8:25:03 AM

Jonas P. Ionin,
Director of Commission Affairs

Planning Department|City & County of San Francisco
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, CA 94103
Direct: 415-558-6309|Fax: 415-558-6409

jonas.ionin@sfgov.org
www.sfplanning.org

-----Original Message-----

From: Bina Shah [<mailto:ebinashah@hotmail.com>]

Sent: Wednesday, April 04, 2018 8:00 AM

To: MayorMarkFarrell (MYR); senator.wiener@senate.ca.gov; Kim, Jane (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Cohen, Malia (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Breed, London (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); SheehyStaff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors, (BOS); richhillissf@gmail.com; Melgar, Myrna (CPC); planning@rodneymfong.com; Koppel, Joel (CPC); Moore, Kathrin (CPC); Richards, Dennis (CPC); Secretary, Commissions (CPC); andrew@tefarch.com; aaron.hyland.hpc@gmail.com; ellen.hpc@ellenjohnckconsulting.com; RSEJohns@yahoo.com; dianematsuda@hotmail.com; jonathan.pearlman.hpc@gmail.com; Rodgers, AnMarie (CPC); gswooding@gmail.com; Quizon, Dyanna (BOS); Miller Hall, Ellie (BOS); info@sfmca.org
Subject: STRONGLY OPPOSING SB 828 and SB 827

Dear Supervisors,

As a San Francisco resident and voter, I strongly urge you to pass a resolution opposing SB 827 and SB 828, with or without amendments. As you know, if these bills are passed the State would hijack each city's control over planning and housing.

All Californian cities and our state deserve much better solutions to housing problems.

These bills would have a catastrophic impact on San Francisco's future.

Thank you,

(Name)

From: [Ionin, Jonas \(CPC\)](#)
To: [Richards, Dennis \(CPC\)](#); [Johnson, Milicent \(CPC\)](#); [Koppel, Joel \(CPC\)](#); [Moore, Kathrin \(CPC\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(CPC\)](#); [planning@rodneyfong.com](#); [Rich Hillis](#); [Aaron Jon Hyland - HPC](#); [Andrew Wolfram \(andrew@tefarch.com\)](#); [Diane Matsuda](#); [Ellen Johnck - HPC](#); [Jonathan Pearlman](#); [Richard S. E. Johns](#)
Cc: [Son, Chanbory \(CPC\)](#); [Feliciano, Josephine \(CPC\)](#)
Subject: FW: *** STATEMENT *** MAYOR MARK FARRELL ON THE SHOOTING AT THE YOU TUBE CAMPUS IN SAN BRUNO
Date: Wednesday, April 04, 2018 8:22:23 AM
Attachments: [4.3.18 San Bruno Shooting.pdf](#)

*Jonas P. Ionin,
Director of Commission Affairs*

Planning Department|City & County of San Francisco
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, CA 94103
Direct: 415-558-6309|Fax: 415-558-6409

jonas.ionin@sfgov.org
www.sfplanning.org

From: MayorsPressOffice, MYR (MYR)
Sent: Tuesday, April 03, 2018 4:45 PM
To: MayorsPressOffice, MYR (MYR)
Subject: *** STATEMENT *** MAYOR MARK FARRELL ON THE SHOOTING AT THE YOU TUBE CAMPUS IN SAN BRUNO

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE:

Tuesday, April 3, 2018

Contact: Mayor's Office of Communications, 415-554-6131

***** STATEMENT *****

**MAYOR MARK FARRELL ON THE SHOOTING
AT THE YOU TUBE CAMPUS IN SAN BRUNO**

“The shooting today at the YouTube campus is the latest in a string of tragedies. Our hearts are with our neighbors in San Bruno and we are sending our deepest sympathies to everyone affected by this incident.

Gun violence is tearing apart our communities. We cannot grow numb to these terrible acts. Republicans in Congress must pass meaningful gun control and safety policies. We know that these changes would reduce gun violence and save lives.

The time for more common sense gun safety and control policies has long since passed. There have been nearly 60 mass shootings this year alone in our nation. We should demand that all of our elected leaders—especially our President—do something to respond to this national crisis.”

###

From: [Ionin, Jonas \(CPC\)](#)
To: [Ikezoe, Paolo \(CPC\)](#)
Cc: [Son, Chanbory \(CPC\)](#); [Feliciano, Josephine \(CPC\)](#)
Subject: 827
Date: Tuesday, April 03, 2018 11:39:03 AM
Attachments: [STRONGLY OPPOSING SB 828 and SB 827.msg](#)
[STRONGLY OPPOSING SB 828 and SB 827.msg](#)

From: [Secretary, Commissions \(CPC\)](#)
To: [Ikezoe, Paolo \(CPC\)](#)
Cc: [Son, Chanbory \(CPC\)](#); [Feliciano, Josephine \(CPC\)](#)
Subject: FW: STRONGLY OPPOSING SB 828 and SB 827
Date: Tuesday, April 03, 2018 11:38:57 AM

Jonas P. Ionin,
Director of Commission Affairs

Planning Department/City & County of San Francisco
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, CA 94103
Direct: 415-558-6309/Fax: 415-558-6409

jonas.ionin@sfgov.org
www.sfplanning.org

-----Original Message-----

From: Andrew C Christie [<mailto:artmetal@earthlink.net>]
Sent: Tuesday, April 03, 2018 10:08 AM
To: MayorMarkFarrell (MYR); senator.wiener@senate.ca.gov; Kim, Jane (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Cohen, Malia (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Breed, London (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); SheehyStaff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors, (BOS); richhillissf@gmail.com; Melgar, Myrna (CPC); planning@rodneymfong.com; Koppel, Joel (CPC); Moore, Kathrin (CPC); Richards, Dennis (CPC); Secretary, Commissions (CPC); andrew@tefarch.com; aaron.hyland.hpc@gmail.com; ellen.hpc@ellenjohnckconsulting.com; RSEJohns@yahoo.com; dianematsuda@hotmail.com; jonathan.pearlman.hpc@gmail.com; Rodgers, AnMarie (CPC); gswooding@gmail.com; Quizon, Dyanna (BOS); Miller Hall, Ellie (BOS); info@sfmca.org
Cc: Susan Meyer
Subject: STRONGLY OPPOSING SB 828 and SB 827

Dear Supervisors,

As a San Francisco resident and voter, I strongly urge you to pass a resolution opposing SB 827 and SB 828, with or without amendments. As you know, if these bills are passed the State would hijack each city's control over planning and housing.

All Californian cities and our state deserve much better solutions to housing problems.

These bills would have a catastrophic impact on San Francisco's future.

Thank you,
Andrew C. Christie (Res. 50 Years)
2859 Octavia Street
San Francisco Ca. 94123

From: [Rodgers, AnMarie \(CPC\)](#)
To: [richhillissf@yahoo.com](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(CPC\)](#); [planning@rodnevfong.com](#); [Johnson, Milicent \(CPC\)](#); [Koppel, Joel \(CPC\)](#); [Moore, Kathrin \(CPC\)](#); [Richards, Dennis \(CPC\)](#); [andrew@tefarch.com](#); [aaron.hyland.hpc@gmail.com](#); [Ellen Johnck - HPC \(ellen.hpc@ellenjohnckconsulting.com\)](#); [dianematsuda@hotmail.com](#); [jonathan.perarلمان.hpc@gmail.com](#); [rsejohns@yahoo.com](#)
Cc: [CTYPLN - COMMISSION SECRETARY](#)
Subject: SFPlanning At SPUR Tomorrow Night
Date: Tuesday, April 03, 2018 10:37:42 AM

Dear Commissioners,

Even with all of the hours of planning presentations that you see, I thought you may be interested to know about this event. We'll be talking about our major projects as SPUR in the Japanese format, Pecha Kucha. This event will make up for all the times that you've found us droning on a bit too long. This format forces us to work in a set and fast-moving format (20 slides/ 20 seconds). Come hear us cover seven complex projects in under seven minutes each. SPUR's Evening Forum, 6pm at 654 Mission Street, this Wednesday, April 4.

Here's our featured projects:

1. **Housing Affordability Strategy.** A framework to evaluate current/future housing policies to best address the City's diverse needs.
2. **Connect SF.** A multi-agency partnership with the public to build an effective, equitable & sustainable transportation system for our future.
3. **Community Stabilization & Anti-Displacement Strategy.** A kit of tools & policies to stabilize our most vulnerable communities.
4. **Waterfront Vision & Adaptation Strategy.** Driven by the need to adapt to rising seas, a strategy to protect homes, communities & businesses from climate hazards while celebrating our iconic waterfront.
5. **Railyards & Boulevard Project.** A study to ensure future rail services best serves the state, the region, the city and the neighborhoods.
6. **The HUB.** A plan to capitalize on the area's growth to best support housing, transportation, the public realm, and the arts.
7. **Central SoMa.** A plan to create a sustainable neighborhood, with social, economic and environmental benefit.

Here's our speakers:

AnMarie Rodgers is the SFPlanning Department's Director of Citywide Policy, overseeing a current staff of 50 and a budget of \$5.9 million. She is proud to have served SFPlanning for 19 years, winning a US congressional commendation for her work; most of all, she works to make planning policy more just and expansive.

James Pappas is a Planner focused on housing policy at the Department who perhaps not so coincidentally also happens to be a native San Franciscan. Prior to joining Planning, James worked for four years on affordable housing preservation and policy at a statewide housing nonprofit and also worked for many years in direct health and social services.

Tam Tran works on ConnectSF, which is our City's long-range transportation planning effort being undertaken with Planning, SFMTA, SFCTA, and OEWD. She brings 14 years of transportation

experience, including corridor studies, multimodal planning, and station area planning.

Kimia Haddadan is a Senior Policy and Legislative Planner and has been with the Department for over 6 years, focusing on housing policy and community development. She has led multiple housing programs and policies, including the City's popular ADU program, and is now advancing the Department's focus on equity leading the Community Stabilization and Anti-Displacement Strategy.

Diana Sokolove is a Principle Planner who has been with the City for 14 years. Ms. Sokolove is leading San Francisco's sea level rise adaptation efforts and co-chairs the Mayor's Sea Level Rise Coordinating Committee.

Susan Gygi is the Project Manager for the Railyard Alternatives and I-280 Boulevard (RAB) Study with over 25 years of professional engineering and planning experience working on all modes of transportation from planning through design, construction, operations, and maintenance.

Lily Langlois is a Senior Planner and has been with the Department for ten years. She is responsible for managing streetscape design projects, public realm plans and community plans. Her work includes the Chinatown Broadway Streetscape Plan, the Haight Ashbury Public Realm Plan, the Ocean and Geneva Avenue Corridor Design Plan, the Market Street Hub Project, the Southeast Framework and Vision Zero.

Steve Wertheim is a Principal Planner at the San Francisco Planning Department. He's been with the Department for 12 years, most of that time working on the Central SoMa Plan, which he loves like a child and can't wait for it to go off to college.

AnMarie Rodgers
Director of Citywide Planning

Planning Department|City and County of San Francisco
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, CA 94103
Direct: 415.558.6395|Fax: 415.558.6409
Email: AnMarie.Rodgers@SFGov.org
Web: <http://sf-planning.org/citywide-planning>

From: [Ionin, Jonas \(CPC\)](#)
To: [Ikezoë, Paolo \(CPC\)](#)
Cc: [Son, Chanbory \(CPC\)](#); [Feliciano, Josephine \(CPC\)](#)
Subject: 827
Date: Monday, April 02, 2018 4:07:59 PM
Attachments: [STRONGLY OPPOSING SB 828 and SB 827.msg](#)
[STRONGLY OPPOSING SB 828 and SB 827.msg](#)

From: [Landis, Deborah \(CPC\)](#)
To: [CTYPLN - CITY PLANNING EVERYONE](#)
Subject: When Fees Are Not Applicable: Updated Memo
Date: Monday, April 02, 2018 4:04:40 PM
Attachments: [PIC Fee Stamp Guidelines 04.02.18.docx](#)

Hi all,

We have updated the N/A Fee Memo (attached) to include the following changes.

- 1) New language stating, "If a project requires legalization work, excluding dwelling unit legalization, a fee should be charged."
- 2) Adding a change in the number of bedrooms to trigger Planning review. (The triggers were previously change of use or change in number of dwelling units.)

Please let me and Liz Watty know if you have any questions.

Thank you,
Deborah

Deborah Landis
Deputy Director of Administration
San Francisco Planning Department
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400 San Francisco, CA 94103
Direct: 415.575.9118 | www.sfplanning.org
[San Francisco Property Information Map](#)

From: [Ionin, Jonas \(CPC\)](#)
To: [Richards, Dennis \(CPC\)](#); [Johnson, Milicent \(CPC\)](#); [Koppel, Joel \(CPC\)](#); [Moore, Kathrin \(CPC\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(CPC\)](#); planning@rodneyfong.com; [Rich Hillis](#); [Aaron Jon Hyland - HPC](#); [Andrew Wolfram \(andrew@tefarch.com\)](mailto:andrew@tefarch.com); [Diane Matsuda](#); [Ellen Johnck - HPC](#); [Jonathan Pearlman](#); [Richard S. E. Johns](#)
Cc: [Son, Chanbory \(CPC\)](#); [Feliciano, Josephine \(CPC\)](#)
Subject: FW: Commission Update for the Week of April 2, 2018
Date: Monday, April 02, 2018 2:22:10 PM
Attachments: [Commission Weekly Update 4.2.18.doc](#)

*Jonas P. Ionin,
Director of Commission Affairs*

Planning Department | City & County of San Francisco
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, CA 94103
Direct: 415-558-6309 | Fax: 415-558-6409

jonas.ionin@sfgov.org
www.sfplanning.org

From: Tsang, Francis
Sent: Monday, April 02, 2018 8:54 AM
To: Tsang, Francis
Subject: Commission Update for the Week of April 2, 2018

Good morning.

Please find a memo attached that outlines items before commissions and boards for this week.
Let me know if you have any questions or concerns.

Francis

Francis Tsang

Deputy Chief of Staff
Office of Mayor Mark Farrell
City and County of San Francisco
415.554.6467 | francis.tsang@sfgov.org

From: [Secretary, Commissions \(CPC\)](#)
To: [Ikezo, Paolo \(CPC\)](#)
Cc: [Son, Chanbory \(CPC\)](#); [Feliciano, Josephine \(CPC\)](#)
Subject: FW: STRONGLY OPPOSE SB 828 and SB 827
Date: Monday, April 02, 2018 2:15:26 PM

*Jonas P. Ionin,
Director of Commission Affairs*

Planning Department!City & County of San Francisco
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, CA 94103
Direct: 415-558-6309!Fax: 415-558-6409

jonas.ionin@sfgov.org
www.sfplanning.org

From: egraham@presynct.com [mailto:egraham@presynct.com]

Sent: Monday, April 02, 2018 2:14 PM

To: MayorMarkFarrell (MYR); senator.wiener@senate.ca.gov; Kim, Jane (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Cohen, Malia (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Breed, London (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); SheehyStaff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors, (BOS); richhillissf@gmail.com; Melgar, Myrna (CPC); planning@rodneymfong.com; Koppel, Joel (CPC); Moore, Kathrin (CPC); Richards, Dennis (CPC); Secretary, Commissions (CPC); andrew@tefarch.com; aaron.hyland.hpc@gmail.com; ellen.hpc@ellenjohnckconsulting.com; RSEJohns@yahoo.com; dianematsuda@hotmail.com; jonathan.pearlman.hpc@gmail.com; Rodgers, AnMarie (CPC); gswooding@gmail.com; Quizon, Dyanna (BOS); Miller Hall, Ellie (BOS); info@sfmca.org

Subject: STRONGLY OPPOSE SB 828 and SB 827

Dear Supervisors:

As a San Francisco resident and voter, I strongly urge you to pass a resolution opposing SB 827 and SB 828, with and without amendments. **These bills allow the State to overrule local control of planning and housing.**

Californians need better solutions to housing problems.

*Evelyn Graham
Pierce St, San Francisco, CA 94123*

From: [Ionin, Jonas \(CPC\)](#)
To: [Ikezoe, Paolo \(CPC\)](#)
Cc: [Son, Chanbory \(CPC\)](#); [Feliciano, Josephine \(CPC\)](#)
Subject: 827
Date: Monday, April 02, 2018 2:15:13 PM
Attachments: [SB 827.msg](#)
[STRONGLY OPPOSING SB 828 and SB 827.msg](#)
[STRONGLY OPPOSING SB 828 and SB 827.msg](#)
[STRONGLY OPPOSING SB 828 and SB 827.msg](#)
[STRONGLY OPPOSING SB 828 and SB 827.msg](#)
[STRONGLY OPPOSING SB 828 and SB 827.msg](#)

From: [Secretary, Commissions \(CPC\)](#)
To: [Ikezoe, Paolo \(CPC\)](#)
Cc: [Son, Chanbory \(CPC\)](#); [Feliciano, Josephine \(CPC\)](#)
Subject: FW: STRONGLY OPPOSING SB 828 and SB 827
Date: Monday, April 02, 2018 2:14:28 PM

Jonas P. Ionin,
Director of Commission Affairs

Planning Department/City & County of San Francisco
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, CA 94103
Direct: 415-558-6309/Fax: 415-558-6409

jonas.ionin@sfgov.org
www.sfplanning.org

-----Original Message-----

From: Sanjay Jain [<mailto:sanjayjain@sbcglobal.net>]
Sent: Saturday, March 31, 2018 9:39 AM
To: MayorMarkFarrell (MYR); senator.wiener@senate.ca.gov; Kim, Jane (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Cohen, Malia (BOS); Sanfra.Fewer@sfgov.org; Breed, London (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); SheehyStaff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors, (BOS); richhillissf@gmail.com; Melgar, Myrna (CPC); planning@rodneymong.com; Koppel, Joel (CPC); Moore, Kathrin (CPC); Richards, Dennis (CPC); Secretary, Commissions (CPC); andrew@tefarch.com; aaron.hyland.hpc@gmail.com; ellen.hpc@ellenjohnckconsulting.com; RSEJohns@yahoo.com; dianematsuda@hotmail.com; jonathan.pearlman.hpc@gmail.com; Rodgers, AnMarie (CPC); gswooding@gmail.com; Quizon, Dyanna (BOS); Miller Hall, Ellie (BOS)
Subject: STRONGLY OPPOSING SB 828 and SB 827

Dear Supervisors,

As a San Francisco resident and voter for over two decades, I strongly urge you to pass a resolution opposing SB 827 and SB 828, with or without amendments. As you know, if these bills are passed the State would hijack each city's control over planning and housing.

All Californian cities and our state deserve much better solutions to housing problems.

I have been appalled by the acceleration of slow and steady encroachment by housing authorities and developers in our San Francisco neighborhoods. These bills are just another example of such mistakes veiled in the noble effort to arrest our city's housing problems. It must be clear to all that more housing, taller housing, and ill-fitting housing is not the solution, but rather perpetuate the problems. Note the enormous amount of empty housing stock in our city, in all the wrong places.

These bills would have a catastrophic impact on San Francisco's future. Please stand up now to stop the problem.

Thank you,

Sanjay Jain
2262 Bay Street
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: [Secretary, Commissions \(CPC\)](#)
To: [Ikezo, Paolo \(CPC\)](#)
Cc: [Son, Chanbory \(CPC\)](#); [Feliciano, Josephine \(CPC\)](#)
Subject: FW: STRONGLY OPPOSING SB 828 and SB 827
Date: Monday, April 02, 2018 2:13:51 PM

*Jonas P. Ionin,
Director of Commission Affairs*

Planning Department!City & County of San Francisco
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, CA 94103
Direct: 415-558-6309!Fax: 415-558-6409

jonas.ionin@sfgov.org
www.sfplanning.org

From: alan silverman [mailto:alansilverman185@comcast.net]
Sent: Monday, April 02, 2018 2:09 PM
To: MayorMarkFarrell (MYR); senator.wiener@senate.ca.gov; Kim, Jane (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Cohen, Malia (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Breed, London (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); SheehyStaff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors, (BOS); richhillissf@gmail.com; Melgar, Myrna (CPC); planning@rodneymfong.com; Koppel, Joel (CPC); Moore, Kathrin (CPC); Richards, Dennis (CPC); Secretary, Commissions (CPC); andrew@tefarch.com; aaron.hyland.hpc@gmail.com; ellen.hpc@ellenjohnckconsulting.com; RSEJohns@yahoo.com; dianematsuda@hotmail.com; jonathan.pearlman.hpc@gmail.com; Rodgers, AnMarie (CPC); gswooding@gmail.com; Quizon, Dyanna (BOS); Miller Hall, Ellie (BOS); info@sfmca.org
Subject: STRONGLY OPPOSING SB 828 and SB 827

Dear Supervisors,

As a San Francisco resident and voter, I strongly urge you to pass a resolution opposing SB 827 and SB 828, with or without amendments.
If these bills are passed the State would remove our city's control over planning and housing. These bills would have a catastrophic impact on San Francisco's neighborhoods.

Thank you,

Alan Silverman

From: [Secretary, Commissions \(CPC\)](#)
To: [Aaron Jon Hyland - HPC](#); [Andrew Wolfram \(andrew@tefarch.com\)](#); [Diane Matsuda](#); [Ellen Johnck - HPC](#); [Jonathan Pearlman](#); [Richard S. E. Johns](#)
Cc: [Feliciano, Josephine \(CPC\)](#); [Frye, Tim \(CPC\)](#)
Subject: FW: "Early Days" stature - Disposition
Date: Monday, April 02, 2018 2:07:42 PM
Attachments: [033118 %22Early Days%22 statue.pdf](#)

Jonas P. Ionin,
Director of Commission Affairs

Planning Department/City & County of San Francisco
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, CA 94103
Direct: 415-558-6309/Fax: 415-558-6409

jonas.ionin@sfgov.org
www.sfplanning.org

-----Original Message-----

From: ddippel@pacific.net [<mailto:ddippel@pacific.net>]
Sent: Saturday, March 31, 2018 3:46 PM
To: Farrell, Mark (MYR)
Cc: mayor@nola.gov; ART-Info; Secretary, Commissions (CPC); matierandross@schronicle.com; Editor
Richmond Review
Subject: "Early Days" stature - Disposition

March 31, 2018

Mayor Mark Farrell
City Hall, Room 200
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
SF, CA-94102

BY REGULAR MAIL, FAXSIMLE & EMAIL
415/554-6160, mark.farrell@sfgov.org

Subject: Disposition of "Early Days" sculpture, "Pioneer Monument", 1894

Dear Mayor Farrell:

New Orleans and San Francisco share much in common- historical relics that time and increasing inclusiveness have marginalized to the point of unpleasant memories we'd like not to give a public place.

Where New Orleans is burdened with images of General Robert E. Lee or other CSA notables that hearken to a grand illusion born of nostalgia about the defense of a way of life that may never have been what people thought it was, San Francisco created a "Pioneer Monument" in 1894 that anchored a sweep of California history using a factual depiction in the "Early Days" of the cruel enslavement of Native peoples by an aristocratic Spanish agrarian society and their religious missionaries. The remaining images catalogue symbolic events and concepts whose dominance drove the tide of California events after the Mexican War of 1846/48. Swept aside by defeat in war were the lifestyles of the Spanish Dons as well as the remnants of fading stone age cultures- the cruel outcome seen with the imbalance of unequal technologies.

I would ask you to reconsider placing the images in "Early Days" in storage or in a museum basement. Rather than recoil at this truthful depiction, think of the "Early Days" as a contrast for what was and what had to be replaced. If a juxtaposition for contrast is unpalatable, then replace this part of the "Pioneer Monument" grouping with an

emblematic depiction of trees and wildlife. A more practical siting of “Early Days” would be in the cemetery at Mission Dolores where likely hundreds of Native peoples are buried anonymously. And, you might also place there the headstone for “Carlotta Valdes”, from “Vertigo”, as a memorial to Alfred Hitchcock.

Very truly yours,

(Signed)

David W. Dippel

Attachment: Letter, D.W. Dippel to Mayor Mitchell J. Landrieu, 3/30/18

cc: SF Historic Preservation Commission; SF Arts Commission; Mayor
Mitchell J. Landrieu,
New Orleans, LA; Matier & Ross, SF Chronicle; & Paul Kozakiewicz, Richmond Review

From: [Ionin, Jonas \(CPC\)](#)
To: [Ikezoë, Paolo \(CPC\)](#)
Cc: [Son, Chanbory \(CPC\)](#); [Feliciano, Josephine \(CPC\)](#)
Subject: 827
Date: Monday, April 02, 2018 2:06:43 PM
Attachments: [STRONGLY OPPOSING SB 828 and SB 827.msg](#)
[STRONGLY OPPOSING SB827 and SB828.msg](#)

From: [Secretary, Commissions \(CPC\)](#)
To: [Ikezo, Paolo \(CPC\)](#)
Cc: [Son, Chanbory \(CPC\)](#); [Feliciano, Josephine \(CPC\)](#)
Subject: FW: STRONGLY OPPOSING SB 828 and SB 827
Date: Monday, April 02, 2018 2:05:46 PM

*Jonas P. Ionin,
Director of Commission Affairs*

Planning Department!City & County of San Francisco
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, CA 94103
Direct: 415-558-6309!Fax: 415-558-6409

jonas.ionin@sfgov.org
www.sfplanning.org

From: Renee Richards and John Hill [mailto:fogline@pacbell.net]
Sent: Monday, April 02, 2018 1:57 PM
To: MayorMarkFarrell (MYR); senator.wiener@senate.ca.gov; Kim, Jane (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Cohen, Malia (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Breed, London (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); SheehyStaff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors, (BOS); richhillissf@gmail.com; Melgar, Myrna (CPC); planning@rodneymfong.com; Koppel, Joel (CPC); Moore, Kathrin (CPC); Richards, Dennis (CPC); Secretary, Commissions (CPC); andrew@tefarch.com; aaron.hyland.hpc@gmail.com; ellen.hpc@ellenjohnnckconsulting.com; RSEJohns@yahoo.com; dianematsuda@hotmail.com; jonathan.pearlman.hpc@gmail.com; Rodgers, AnMarie (CPC); gswooding@gmail.com; Quizon, Dyanna (BOS); Miller Hall, Ellie (BOS); info@sfmca.org
Subject: STRONGLY OPPOSING SB 828 and SB 827

Dear Supervisors,

As a San Francisco resident and voter, I strongly urge you to pass a resolution opposing SB 827 and SB 828, with or without amendments. As you know, if these bills are passed the State would highjack each city's control over planning and housing.

All Californian cities and our state deserve much better solutions to housing problems.

These bills would have a catastrophic impact on San Francisco's future.

Thank you,

Renee A. Richards
666 42nd Ave.
SF, CA 94121

From: [Bintliff, Jacob \(CPC\)](#)
To: [CTYPLN - CITY PLANNING EVERYONE](#)
Subject: Process Changes - April roundup
Date: Friday, March 30, 2018 3:38:12 PM
Attachments: [Resend - PPA - Simplified PPTS workflow.msg](#)
[Notification Process Changes.msg](#)
[Neighborhood Notification Changes.msg](#)
[FW New Commission Packet Templates.msg](#)
Importance: High

Hi everyone –

It's Spring, and change is in the air ☺ This is a summary of **several important process changes that take effect in April**, some of which you have already heard about. We recognize there is a lot happening at once, and we are doing our best to be sure that all internal and public materials are updated to reflect these new procedures as soon as possible. **If you notice any internal or public information that appears out of date over the coming weeks, please shoot me an email to let me know and we will fix it.** I would also like to hear about any recurring issues or complaints you may hear from applicants or members of the public regarding any of this, at any time.

In this email

1. PPA streamlined process (April 2)
2. Neighborhood Notification in-house mailing lists (April 2)
3. PIC Preservation shifts (April 9)
4. Commission Packet Template (for April 12 hearings)

First, let me recognize the excellent work of several of our colleagues in making this all happen.

Candace Soohoo, Erica Russell, Laura Lynch, Alana Callagy, Mike Wynne, Michelle Langlie, Gina Simi, John Speer, Alton Chinn, and John Boldrick. We could not have done this without you. **Thank you!** Also, huge thanks to our Executive Directive “steering committee” Wade Wietgreffe, Liz Watty, Rich Sucre, Glenn Cabrerros, Deborah Landis, Mat Snyder, Kate Conner, and Maia Small.

1. PPA Streamlined Process (effective April 2)

(A public summary of these changes is on the Planning Department homepage [here](#). Revised PPA info packet and application will be online and at PIC Monday morning)

(Please also see Glenn's email regarding the revised Accela workflow for PPAs in the attached email)

- The Department will not accept **Environmental Evaluation applications (EEAs)** until after a PPA letter has been issued.
- The response time for a PPA will be **60 days**, down from the current 90-day timeframe.
 - *Note: For all PPAs accepted before April 2, the 90 day deadline will still apply.*
- Planners assigned to a PPA will use a **new streamlined PPA response letter**. This template will be up on SharePoint by the end of next week for use.
 - *Note: If you are the PPA Coordinator for a PPA that was accepted before April 2, it is up to you whether to use the current PPA letter template or the new one. If the PPA team has already started working in the old template, I assume it will be easiest to keep with that, but please choose the path you think will be most efficient to meet*

your deadline. Please let me know if you do choose the new template.

- PPA meetings:
 - The Department will no longer offer a pre-PPA meeting with the applicant.
 - All Planners assigned to a PPA are expected to attend the UDAT meeting for that PPA. This meeting will be used to discuss design issues, and also for the project team to identify the key overarching Department concerns for the project. UDAT meetings will be scheduled roughly three weeks after submittal.
 - PPAs that trigger SDAT review will go to SDAT as soon as two weeks after submittal. It is recommended that all PPA planners attend the SDAT meeting, but not required.
 - The Department will still offer one post-PPA meeting with the applicant.
- PPA staffing: Current Planners will serve as Coordinator for all PPAs. Environmental Planning and Citywide Planning will continue to assign staff to each PPA, as appropriate.
- The thresholds for when a PPA is required will change to the below. We expect this change will reduce our PPA volume by about 20%
 - Creation of 10 or more dwelling units;
 - Creation or expansion of any Group Housing use; *and/or*
 - Construction of a new non-residential building or addition of 10,000 square feet or more.

2. Neighborhood Notification in-house mailing lists (effective April 2)

(Revised Neighborhood Notification info packet will be online and at PIC Monday morning)

- Just a reminder. For details, see Liz's email attached here. Thanks again to Mike Wynne for developing this fabulous new tool!

3. PIC Preservation Shifts (effective April 9)

- Starting April 9, Preservation staff will be at PIC from 10:15 – 2:45 Monday – Thursday and from 10:15 – 12:30 on Fridays. This is intended to reduce confusion and wait times for members of the public and applicants needing OTC Preservation review.
- A public announcement of these changes is on the Planning Department homepage [here](#) and the PIC page has been updated [here](#).
- Special thanks for Michelle Langlie for spearheading this! Please contact Michelle with any questions about Preservation hours at PIC.

4. New Commission Packet Template (effective for hearings April 12 and after)

- Just a reminder. For details, see Liz's email attached here. Thank you to the Accela team for making this happen!

Thank you all, and have a wonderful Passover/Easter/April Fool's or just plain weekend!

Jacob

Jacob Bintliff, MCP
Senior Planner

San Francisco Planning Department
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400 San Francisco, CA 94103
Direct: 415.575.9170 | www.sfplanning.org
[San Francisco Property Information Map](#)

From: [Son, Chanbory \(CPC\)](#)
To: [Feliciano, Josephine \(CPC\)](#)
Subject: FW: STRONGLY OPPOSING SB 828 and SB 827
Date: Thursday, March 29, 2018 11:13:33 AM

**Chanbory Son, Executive Secretary
Commission Affairs**

San Francisco Planning Department
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400 San Francisco, CA 94103
Direct: 415.575.6926 | www.sfplanning.org
[San Francisco Property Information Map](#)

From: Secretary, Commissions (CPC)
Sent: Thursday, March 29, 2018 10:08 AM
To: Ikezoe, Paolo (CPC)
Cc: Son, Chanbory (CPC)
Subject: FW: STRONGLY OPPOSING SB 828 and SB 827

*Jonas P. Ionin,
Director of Commission Affairs*

Planning Department|City & County of San Francisco
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, CA 94103
Direct: 415-558-6309|Fax: 415-558-6409

jonas.ionin@sfgov.org
www.sfplanning.org

From: Bret Andrews [<mailto:bretandrews@pacbell.net>]
Sent: Thursday, March 29, 2018 8:12 AM
To: MayorMarkFarrell (MYR); senator.wiener@senate.ca.gov; Kim, Jane (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Cohen, Malia (BOS); Sanfra.Fewer@sfgov.org; Breed, London (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); SheehyStaff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors, (BOS); richhillissf@gmail.com; Melgar, Myrna (CPC); planning@rodneymfong.com; Koppel, Joel (CPC); Moore, Kathrin (CPC); Richards, Dennis (CPC); Secretary, Commissions (CPC); andrew@tefarch.com; aaron.hyland.hpc@gmail.com; ellen.hpc@ellenjohnckconsulting.com; RSEJohns@yahoo.com; dianematsuda@hotmail.com; jonathan.pearlman.hpc@gmail.com; Rodgers, AnMarie (CPC); gswooding@gmail.com; Quizon, Dyanna (BOS); Miller Hall, Ellie (BOS)
Subject: STRONGLY OPPOSING SB 828 and SB 827

Dear Supervisors,

As a San Francisco resident and voter, I strongly urge you to pass a resolution opposing SB 827 and SB 828, with or without amendments. These bills are not the solution to ANY problem. Furthermore, they will destroy many beautiful California cities such as San Francisco to the benefit of developers pocket books.

Please OPPOSE!

Kind Regards,

Bret Andrews

3211 Baker St., San Francisco

From: [Son, Chanbory \(CPC\)](#)
To: [Feliciano, Josephine \(CPC\)](#)
Subject: FW: STRONGLY OPPOSING SB 828 and SB 827
Date: Thursday, March 29, 2018 11:13:23 AM

Chanbory Son, Executive Secretary
Commission Affairs
San Francisco Planning Department
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400 San Francisco, CA 94103
Direct: 415.575.6926 | www.sfplanning.org
San Francisco Property Information Map

-----Original Message-----

From: Secretary, Commissions (CPC)
Sent: Thursday, March 29, 2018 10:06 AM
To: Ikezoe, Paolo (CPC)
Cc: Son, Chanbory (CPC)
Subject: FW: STRONGLY OPPOSING SB 828 and SB 827

Jonas P. Ionin,
Director of Commission Affairs

Planning Department|City & County of San Francisco
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, CA 94103
Direct: 415-558-6309|Fax: 415-558-6409

jonas.ionin@sfgov.org
www.sfplanning.org

-----Original Message-----

From: Suzanne Russack [<mailto:sukirussack@gmail.com>]
Sent: Thursday, March 29, 2018 9:36 AM
To: MayorMarkFarrell (MYR); senator.wiener@senate.ca.gov; Kim, Jane (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Cohen, Malia (BOS); Sanfra.Fewer@sfgov.org; Breed, London (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); SheehyStaff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors, (BOS); richhillissf@gmail.com; Melgar, Myrna (CPC); planning@rodneymong.com; Koppel, Joel (CPC); Moore, Kathrin (CPC); Richards, Dennis (CPC); Secretary, Commissions (CPC); andrew@tefarch.com; aaron.hyland.hpc@gmail.com; ellen.hpc@ellenjohnckconsulting.com; RSEJohns@yahoo.com; dianematsuda@hotmail.com; jonathan.pearlman.hpc@gmail.com; Rodgers, AnMarie (CPC); gswooding@gmail.com; Quizon, Dyanna (BOS); Miller Hall, Ellie (BOS)
Subject: STRONGLY OPPOSING SB 828 and SB 827

Dear Supervisors,

As a San Francisco resident and voter, I strongly urge you to pass a resolution opposing SB 827 and SB 828, with or without amendments. As you know, if these bills are passed the State would hijack each city's control over planning and housing.

All Californian cities and our state deserve much better solutions to housing problems.

These bills would have a catastrophic impact on San Francisco's future.

Thank you,

Suzanne Russack

From: [Son, Chanbory \(CPC\)](#)
To: [Feliciano, Josephine \(CPC\)](#)
Subject: FW: STRONGLY OPPOSING SB 828 and SB 827
Date: Thursday, March 29, 2018 11:13:16 AM

Chanbory Son, Executive Secretary
Commission Affairs
San Francisco Planning Department
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400 San Francisco, CA 94103
Direct: 415.575.6926 | www.sfplanning.org
San Francisco Property Information Map

-----Original Message-----

From: Secretary, Commissions (CPC)
Sent: Thursday, March 29, 2018 10:06 AM
To: Ikezoe, Paolo (CPC)
Cc: Son, Chanbory (CPC)
Subject: FW: STRONGLY OPPOSING SB 828 and SB 827

Jonas P. Ionin,
Director of Commission Affairs

Planning Department|City & County of San Francisco
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, CA 94103
Direct: 415-558-6309|Fax: 415-558-6409

jonas.ionin@sfgov.org
www.sfplanning.org

-----Original Message-----

From: George K. Merijohn, DDS [<mailto:merijohn@merijohn.com>]
Sent: Wednesday, March 28, 2018 6:59 PM
To: MayorMarkFarrell (MYR); senator.wiener@senate.ca.gov; Kim, Jane (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Cohen, Malia (BOS); Sanfra.Fewer@sfgov.org; Breed, London (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); SheehyStaff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors, (BOS); richhillissf@gmail.com; Melgar, Myrna (CPC); planning@rodneymfong.com; Koppel, Joel (CPC); Moore, Kathrin (CPC); Richards, Dennis (CPC); Secretary, Commissions (CPC); andrew@tefarch.com; aaron.hyland.hpc@gmail.com; ellen.hpc@ellenjohnckconsulting.com; RSEJohns@yahoo.com; dianematsuda@hotmail.com; jonathan.pearlman.hpc@gmail.com; Rodgers, AnMarie (CPC); gswooding@gmail.com; Quizon, Dyanna (BOS); Miller Hall, Ellie (BOS)
Subject: STRONGLY OPPOSING SB 828 and SB 827

Dear Supervisors,

As a San Francisco resident and voter, I strongly urge you to pass a resolution opposing SB 827 and SB 828, with or without amendments. As you know, if these bills are passed the State would hijack each city's control over planning and housing.

All Californian cities and our state deserve much better solutions to housing problems.

These bills would have a catastrophic impact on San Francisco's future.

Thank you,

George K. Merijohn

From: [Son, Chanbory \(CPC\)](#)
To: [Feliciano, Josephine \(CPC\)](#)
Subject: FW: STRONGLY OPPOSING SB 828 and SB 827
Date: Thursday, March 29, 2018 11:13:06 AM

Chanbory Son, Executive Secretary
Commission Affairs
San Francisco Planning Department
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400 San Francisco, CA 94103
Direct: 415.575.6926 | www.sfplanning.org
San Francisco Property Information Map

-----Original Message-----

From: Secretary, Commissions (CPC)
Sent: Thursday, March 29, 2018 10:05 AM
To: Ikezoe, Paolo (CPC)
Cc: Son, Chanbory (CPC)
Subject: FW: STRONGLY OPPOSING SB 828 and SB 827

Jonas P. Ionin,
Director of Commission Affairs

Planning Department|City & County of San Francisco
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, CA 94103
Direct: 415-558-6309|Fax: 415-558-6409

jonas.ionin@sfgov.org
www.sfplanning.org

-----Original Message-----

From: Susan Spiwak [<mailto:susie@merijohn.com>]
Sent: Wednesday, March 28, 2018 6:56 PM
To: MayorMarkFarrell (MYR); senator.wiener@senate.ca.gov; Kim, Jane (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Cohen, Malia (BOS); Sanfra.Fewer@sfgov.org; Breed, London (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); SheehyStaff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors, (BOS); richhillissf@gmail.com; Melgar, Myrna (CPC); planning@rodneymfong.com; Koppel, Joel (CPC); Moore, Kathrin (CPC); Richards, Dennis (CPC); Secretary, Commissions (CPC); andrew@tefarch.com; aaron.hyland.hpc@gmail.com; ellen.hpc@ellenjohnckconsulting.com; RSEJohns@yahoo.com; dianematsuda@hotmail.com; jonathan.pearlman.hpc@gmail.com; Rodgers, AnMarie (CPC); gswooding@gmail.com; Quizon, Dyanna (BOS); Miller Hall, Ellie (BOS)
Subject: STRONGLY OPPOSING SB 828 and SB 827

Dear Supervisors,

As a San Francisco resident and voter, I strongly urge you to pass a resolution opposing SB 827 and SB 828, with or without amendments. As you know, if these bills are passed the State would hijack each city's control over planning and housing.

All Californian cities and our state deserve much better solutions to housing problems.

These bills would have a catastrophic impact on San Francisco's future.

Thank you,

Susan Spiwak

From: [Son, Chanbory \(CPC\)](#)
To: [Feliciano, Josephine \(CPC\)](#)
Subject: FW: STRONGLY OPPOSING SB 828 and SB 827
Date: Thursday, March 29, 2018 11:12:56 AM

Chanbory Son, Executive Secretary
Commission Affairs
San Francisco Planning Department
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400 San Francisco, CA 94103
Direct: 415.575.6926 | www.sfplanning.org
San Francisco Property Information Map

-----Original Message-----

From: Secretary, Commissions (CPC)
Sent: Thursday, March 29, 2018 10:05 AM
To: Ikezoe, Paolo (CPC)
Cc: Son, Chanbory (CPC)
Subject: FW: STRONGLY OPPOSING SB 828 and SB 827

Jonas P. Ionin,
Director of Commission Affairs

Planning Department|City & County of San Francisco
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, CA 94103
Direct: 415-558-6309|Fax: 415-558-6409

jonas.ionin@sfgov.org
www.sfplanning.org

-----Original Message-----

From: Dan Friedman [<mailto:djfvendor@comcast.net>]
Sent: Wednesday, March 28, 2018 3:51 PM
To: MayorMarkFarrell (MYR); senator.wiener@senate.ca.gov; Kim, Jane (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Cohen, Malia (BOS); Sanfra.Fewer@sfgov.org; Breed, London (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); SheehyStaff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors, (BOS); richhillissf@gmail.com; Melgar, Myrna (CPC); planning@rodneymfong.com; Koppel, Joel (CPC); Moore, Kathrin (CPC); Richards, Dennis (CPC); Secretary, Commissions (CPC); andrew@tefarch.com; aaron.hyland.hpc@gmail.com; ellen.hpc@ellenjohnckconsulting.com; RSEJohns@yahoo.com; dianematsuda@hotmail.com; jonathan.pearlman.hpc@gmail.com; Rodgers, AnMarie (CPC); gswooding@gmail.com; Quizon, Dyanna (BOS); Miller Hall, Ellie (BOS)
Subject: STRONGLY OPPOSING SB 828 and SB 827

Dear Supervisors,

As a San Francisco resident and voter, I strongly urge you to pass a resolution opposing SB 827 and SB 828, with or without amendments. As you know, if these bills are passed the State would hijack each city's control over planning and housing.

All Californian cities and our state deserve much better solutions to housing problems.

These bills would have a catastrophic impact on San Francisco's future.

Thank you,

Dan and Barbara Friedman
Scott St.

From: [Son, Chanbory \(CPC\)](#)
To: [Feliciano, Josephine \(CPC\)](#)
Subject: FW: SB 827 and 828
Date: Thursday, March 29, 2018 11:12:38 AM
Attachments: [STRONGLY OPPOSING SB 828 and SB 827.msg](#)
[STRONGLY OPPOSING SB 828 and SB 827.msg](#)
[STRONGLY OPPOSING SB 828 and SB 827.msg](#)
[STRONGLY OPPOSING SB 828 and SB 827.msg](#)
[STRONGLY OPPOSING SB 828 and SB 827.msg](#)
[STRONGLY OPPOSING SB 828 and SB 827.msg](#)

Chanbory Son, Executive Secretary
Commission Affairs

San Francisco Planning Department
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400 San Francisco, CA 94103
Direct: 415.575.6926 | www.sfplanning.org
[San Francisco Property Information Map](#)

From: Ionin, Jonas (CPC)
Sent: Thursday, March 29, 2018 10:03 AM
To: Ikezoe, Paolo (CPC)
Cc: Son, Chanbory (CPC)
Subject: SB 827 and 828

From: [Secretary, Commissions \(CPC\)](#)
To: [Ikezo, Paolo \(CPC\)](#)
Cc: [Son, Chanbory \(CPC\)](#); [Feliciano, Josephine \(CPC\)](#)
Subject: FW: STRONGLY OPPOSING SB 828 and SB 827
Date: Thursday, March 29, 2018 11:01:33 AM

*Jonas P. Ionin,
Director of Commission Affairs*

Planning Department!City & County of San Francisco
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, CA 94103
Direct: 415-558-6309!Fax: 415-558-6409

jonas.ionin@sfgov.org
www.sfplanning.org

From: Kim Andrews [mailto:kimandrews@pacbell.net]
Sent: Thursday, March 29, 2018 10:20 AM
To: MayorMarkFarrell (MYR); senator.wiener@senate.ca.gov; Kim, Jane (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Cohen, Malia (BOS); Sanfra.Fewer@sfgov.org; Breed, London (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); SheehyStaff (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Board of Supervisors, (BOS); richhillissf@gmail.com; Melgar, Myrna (CPC); planning@rodneymfong.com; Koppel, Joel (CPC); Moore, Kathrin (CPC); Richards, Dennis (CPC); Secretary, Commissions (CPC); andrew@tefarch.com; aaron.hyland.hpc@gmail.com; ellen.hpc@ellenjohnckconsulting.com; RSEJohns@yahoo.com; dianematsuda@hotmail.com; jonathan.pearlman.hpc@gmail.com; Rodgers, AnMarie (CPC); gswooding@gmail.com; Quizon, Dyanna (BOS); Miller Hall, Ellie (BOS)
Subject: STRONGLY OPPOSING SB 828 and SB 827

Dear Supervisors,

As a San Francisco resident and voter, I strongly urge you to pass a resolution opposing SB 827 and SB 828, with or without amendments. As you know, if these bills are passed the State would highjack each city's control over planning and housing. All Californian cities and our state deserve much better solutions to housing problems.

These bills would have a catastrophic impact on San Francisco's future.

Thank you,

Kim Andrews

3211 Baker St.

San Francisco, CA 94123

From: [Son, Chanbory \(CPC\)](#)
To: [Rich Hillis \(richhillissf@gmail.com\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(CPC\)](#); "Rodney Fong"; [Johnson, Milicent \(CPC\)](#); [Koppel, Joel \(CPC\)](#); [Moore, Kathrin \(CPC\)](#); [Richards, Dennis \(CPC\)](#); [Andrew Wolfram](#); [Aaron Jon Hyland - HPC](#); [Ellen Johnck - HPC](#); [Richard S. E. Johns](#); [Dianematsuda@hotmail.com](#); [kateinsf@aol.com](#)
Cc: [CTYPLN - COMMISSION SECRETARY](#)
Subject: FW: Notice of New Law Related to April 2 Filing Deadlines
Date: Wednesday, March 28, 2018 2:00:08 PM
Attachments: [image004.png](#)
[ATT00001.htm](#)
[Communication NoFile-NoVote - Mar 27 2018 .pdf](#)
[ATT00002.htm](#)
Importance: High

Commissioners,
Please disregard previous email. See below.

Chanbory Son, Executive Secretary
Commission Affairs
San Francisco Planning Department
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400 San Francisco, CA 94103
Direct: 415.575.6926 | www.sfplanning.org
[San Francisco Property Information Map](#)

Begin forwarded message:

From: "Pelham, Leeann (ETH)" <leeann.pelham@sfgov.org>
Date: March 27, 2018 at 7:24:25 PM PDT
To: "Pelham, Leeann (ETH)" <leeann.pelham@sfgov.org>
Subject: Notice of New Law Related to April 2 Filing Deadlines

Dear City Board and Commission Members:

This notice is provided to alert you to a new City law that could impact your ability to participate in or take action on matters pending before your board or commission, and to remind you of critical steps to take now to avoid inadvertently breaching the new law's provisions.

Operative April 16, 2018, a new "*no file-no vote*" law will be in place. This new law is designed to strengthen public confidence in the integrity of government by ensuring that board and commission members have the information and tools they need to avoid conflicts of interests. It is also designed to support transparency in government by supporting the public's ability to monitor officials' compliance with core ethics standards of City service.

From: [Rahaim, John \(CPC\)](#)
To: [CTYPLN - CITY PLANNING EVERYONE](#)
Subject: Responding to calls and messages
Date: Wednesday, March 28, 2018 1:20:49 PM
Importance: High

All, an important reminder that it is Department policy to return phone calls and emails within 24 hours. I fully realize that we are all extremely busy and receive many calls, emails and other messages. But professional courtesy, and our role as public sector employees, require us to be responsive. To be clear, the response can simply be an acknowledgment of the receipt of the message with an estimate of when you will get back to the caller/sender.

This is important to our work, our relationships with the community to the image of the Department, and to me. Please do heed this requirement.

John

John Rahaim
Planning Director

Andrea Green
Executive Assistant

john.rahaim@sfgov.org 415-558-6411
andrea.green@sfgov.org 415-558-6268
1650 Mission Street Suite 400
San Francisco CA 94103

From: [Peterson, Pedro \(CPC\)](#)
To: [CTYPLN - CITY PLANNING EVERYONE](#)
Subject: New Code Summary: Amendments to the Mission Street Neighborhood Commercial Transit District related to the Mission Action Plan 2020
Date: Monday, March 26, 2018 1:32:59 PM
Attachments: [MissionNCT Amendments PC Summary.pdf](#)

New Planning Code Summary:
**Amendments to the Mission Street
Neighborhood Commercial Transit
District related to the Mission Action Plan 2020**

Amended Sections: 121.2, 121.7, and 754
Case Number: 2015-000988PCA-03
Board File/Enactment #: 171173/017-18
Initiated by: Supervisor Ronen
Effective Date: March 11, 2018

The Ordinance amended Planning Code sections 121.2, 121.7, and 754 to achieve the following: 1) remove Non-Retail Professional Services (previously known as Administrative Services) as a permitted use in the Mission Street Neighborhood Commercial Transit District (NCT); 2) limit the merging of lots in the Mission Street NCT; 3) allow Arts Activities and Catering uses in the Mission Street NCT.

The Way It Was:

1. Section 121.2 of the Planning Code limits uses on Mission Street above 6,000 square feet
2. Section 121.7 of the Planning Code does not limit lot mergers in the Mission Street NCT
3. Section 754 of the Planning Code (Mission Street NCT) controls the following uses as such:
 - a) Non-Retail Professional Services are permitted as a conditional use
 - b) Arts activities and catering are not permitted

The Way It Is Now:

1. Section 121.2 of the Planning Code now limits the merger of commercial spaces when the merger results in spaces greater than 2,500 square feet, but only in buildings located on parcels that were created from lot mergers after adoption of this ordinance.
2. Section 121.7 of the Planning Code restricts lot mergers in the Mission Street NCT to a limit of 100 feet of lot frontage on Mission Street. Lot mergers that result in street

frontages between 50 and 100 feet will be required to provide at least one space fronting Mission Street of no more than 2,500 square feet.

3. The following changes will be made to section 754 of the Planning Code (Mission Street NCT):

- a) Non-Retail Professional Services will be removed as a permitted use
- b) Arts activities and catering will be permitted on all floors

Link to Signed Legislation:

<https://sfgov.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=5800652&GUID=8899B817-D6FB-4432-B12D-49ABE81FF3CA>

Pedro Peterson, Senior Planner

Citywide Planning Division

San Francisco Planning Department

1650 Mission Street, Suite 400 San Francisco, CA 94103

Direct: 415.575.9163 | www.sfplanning.org

[San Francisco Property Information Map](#)

From: [Ionin, Jonas \(CPC\)](#)
To: [Richards, Dennis \(CPC\)](#); [Johnson, Milicent \(CPC\)](#); [Koppel, Joel \(CPC\)](#); [Moore, Kathrin \(CPC\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(CPC\)](#); planning@rodneyfong.com; [Rich Hillis](#); [Aaron Jon Hyland - HPC](#); [Andrew Wolfram \(andrew@tefarch.com\)](mailto:andrew@tefarch.com); [Diane Matsuda](#); [Ellen Johnck - HPC](#); [Jonathan Pearlman](#); [Richard S. E. Johns](#)
Cc: [CTYPLN - COMMISSION SECRETARY](#)
Subject: FW: Commission Update for Week of March 26, 2018
Date: Monday, March 26, 2018 12:13:35 PM
Attachments: [Commission Weekly Update 3.26.18.doc](#)

*Jonas P. Ionin,
Director of Commission Affairs*

Planning Department | City & County of San Francisco
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, CA 94103
Direct: 415-558-6309 | Fax: 415-558-6409

jonas.ionin@sfgov.org
www.sfplanning.org

From: Tsang, Francis
Sent: Monday, March 26, 2018 8:57 AM
To: Tsang, Francis
Subject: Commission Update for Week of March 26, 2018

Good morning.

Please find a memo attached that outlines items before commissions and boards for this week.

Let me know if you have any questions or concerns.

Francis

Francis Tsang

Deputy Chief of Staff
Office of Mayor Mark Farrell
City and County of San Francisco
415.554.6467 | francis.tsang@sfgov.org

From: [Grob, Carly \(CPC\)](#)
To: [CTYPLN - CITY PLANNING EVERYONE](#)
Subject: New Code Summary: Inclusionary Affordable Housing Program (aka The Palmer Fix)
Date: Monday, March 26, 2018 10:43:23 AM
Attachments: [Code Summary - Inclusionary Housing Program.pdf](#)

Hi Everyone,

As you may be aware, The Palmer Fix (AB 1505) was signed by Governor Brown last September, and became effective State-wide on January 1. The Palmer Fix restores the City's ability to require on-site and off-site inclusionary rental units without qualifying for an exemption from Costa Hawkins. The attached Code Summary reflects changes to Section 415 which were required to implement the State legislation by removing references to Costa Hawkins Agreements in our local Code.

What does this mean for you? NO MORE COSTA HAWKINS FOR INCLUSIONARY, STARTING TODAY! Please note that you will need to complete any partially-executed Costa Hawkins agreement for any project that was approved before the effective date of the local legislation, which was 3/25/18. Also keep in mind that you'll still need a Costa Hawkins for ADUs when appropriate.

Please let me know if you have any questions. Thanks!

New Planning Code Summary:

Inclusionary Affordable Housing Program Amendment, a.k.a. The Palmer Fix

Amended Sections: 415, 124 and 406
Case Number: 2017-014892PCA
Board File/Enactment #: 171193/26-18
Initiated by: Supervisor Peskin
Effective Date: March 25, 2017

The proposed Ordinance amended the Inclusionary Affordable Housing Ordinance (Planning Code Section 415) to remove the requirement that on-site and off-site inclusionary units within a new development be ownership units rather than rental units.

The Way It Was:

Project sponsors may comply with the requirements of the Inclusionary Affordable Housing Program, set forth in Planning Code section 415 et. seq., by paying an impact fee, providing affordable units on-site, or providing affordable units off-site. On-site or off-site

affordable units must be ownership units unless a developer can demonstrate that the development qualifies for an exemption from the Costa-Hawkins Rental Housing Act (CA Civil Code Section 1954.50 – “Costa Hawkins”). Generally, Costa Hawkins prohibits rent control on new residential units, unless the development has received density bonuses or other zoning modifications. The project sponsor would enter into a Costa Hawkins Agreement with the City, demonstrating that the project's on- or off-site units are not subject to the Costa Hawkins because the project is receiving a development bonus or direct financial contribution.

The Way It Is Now:

This Ordinance would amend Planning Code Section 415 to allow affordable units on-site and off-site rental units without the need to qualify for an exemption from Costa Hawkins.

Link to Signed Legislation:

<https://sfgov.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=5828425&GUID=AC9A51E2-C663-44A2-8920-E5FB91438639>

Carly Grob, Senior Planner
Office of Executive Programs

Planning Department, City and County of San Francisco
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, CA 94103

Direct: 415-575-9138 **Fax:** 415-558-6409

Email: carly.grob@sfgov.org

Web: www.sfplanning.org

From: [Sanchez, Diego \(CPC\)](#)
To: [CTYPLN - CITY PLANNING EVERYONE](#)
Subject: New Code Summary: Jackson Square SUD (BF171108)
Date: Friday, March 23, 2018 3:51:04 PM
Attachments: [171108 Jackson Square SUD.pdf](#)

**New Planning Code Summary:
Restaurant and Bar Uses in Jackson Square, Broadway and North Beach, and
Pacific Avenue Office Uses**

Amended Sections: 178, 249.25, 714, 722 and 783
Case Number: 2017-013742PCA
Board File/Enactment #: 171108/47-18
Initiated by: Supervisor Peskin
Effective Date: April 15, 2018

The proposed Ordinance amended the Planning Code to limit eating and drinking uses and require Conditional Use authorization for Office, Business Service and Institutional Uses fronting Pacific Avenue in the Jackson Square SUD. The Ordinance also shortened the abandonment period for a Restaurant use in the North Beach Neighborhood Commercial District to 18 months.

The Way It Was:

1. Within the Jackson Square SUD Limited Restaurants, Restaurants and Bars were principally permitted.
2. Within the Jackson Square SUD new eating and drinking uses were allowed to occupy tenant spaces last legally occupied by any use.
3. Within the Jackson Square SUD any use could have converted to a Limited Restaurant, a Restaurant or a Bar use.
4. Within the Jackson Square SUD Conditional Use authorization was not required to establish an Office use, Business Service Uses or Institutional Use that fronted Pacific Avenue.
5. Within the North Beach Neighborhood Commercial District, a Restaurant use was considered discontinued and abandoned if the period of non-use was three years.

The Way It Is Now:

1. Within the Jackson Square SUD Limited Restaurants, Restaurants and Bars require Conditional Use authorization.
2. Within the Jackson Square SUD:
 - a. Bar uses may only occupy spaces currently or last legally occupied by a Bar use;
 - b. Restaurant uses may only occupy spaces currently or last legally occupied by a Bar or Restaurant use; and
 - c. Limited Restaurant uses may only occupy spaces currently or last legally occupied by a Bar, Restaurant, or Limited Restaurant use.
3. Within the Jackson Square SUD only existing eating and drinking uses may convert to Limited Restaurant, Restaurant or Bar uses.
4. Within the Jackson Square SUD Conditional Use authorization is required to establish an Office use, Business Service Uses or Institutional Use that fronts Pacific Avenue.
5. Within the North Beach Neighborhood Commercial District, a Restaurant use is considered discontinued and abandoned if the period of non-use is 18 months.

Link to Signed Legislation:

<https://sfgov.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=6034098&GUID=45C95D93-52AA-4C05-98E7-A5E6E744B82D>

DIEGO R SANCHEZ
SENIOR PLANNER, LEGISLATIVE ANALYST
SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT
1650 MISSION STREET, STE 400
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94103
(415) 575 – 9082