

SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING COMMISSION

Meeting Minutes

Commission Chambers, Room 400
City Hall, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Thursday, December 12, 2024
12:00 p.m.
Regular Meeting

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: SO, MOORE, BRAUN, CAMPBELL, IMPERIAL, MCGARRY, WILLIAMS
COMMISSIONERS ABSENT: NONE

THE MEETING WAS CALLED TO ORDER BY PRESIDENT SO AT 12:07 PM

STAFF IN ATTENDANCE: Aaron Starr, Michelle Langlie, Veronica Flores, Lily Langlois, Joseph Sacchi, Matt Dito, Corey Teague – Zoning Administrator, Elizabeth Watty – Director of Current Planning, Rich Hillis – Planning Director, Jonas P. Ionin – Commission Secretary

SPEAKER KEY:

- + INDICATES A SPEAKER IN SUPPORT OF AN ITEM;
- INDICATES A SPEAKER IN OPPOSITION TO AN ITEM; AND
- = INDICATES A NEUTRAL SPEAKER OR A SPEAKER WHO DID NOT INDICATE SUPPORT OR OPPOSITION.

A. CONSIDERATION 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. 2024-002816CUA (M. TAYLOR: (628) 652-7352)
28-30 DAY STREET – north side between San Jose Avenue and Dolores Street; Lot 007 in Assessor's Block 6634 (District 8) – Request for **Conditional Use Authorization** pursuant to Planning Code Sections 303 and 317 to demolish an existing building with two legal dwelling units and one unauthorized dwelling unit and construct a new three-unit residential building within the Residential- House, Three Family Zoning District and Central Neighborhoods Large Residence Special Use District, and 40-X Height and Bulk District. The Planning

Department found that the project is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The Commission's action constitutes the Approval Action for the project for the purposes of CEQA, pursuant to San Francisco Administrative Code Section [31.04\(h\)](#).

(Continued from Regular hearing on October 24, 2024)

(Proposed for Continuance to January 9, 2025)

SPEAKERS: None
 ACTION: Continued to January 9, 2025
 AYES: Campbell, McGarry, Williams, Braun, Imperial, Moore, So
 NAYS: None
 ABSENT: None

2. 2024-000521DRP (D. WINSLOW: (628) 652-7335)
411 CLIPPER STREET – south side between Castro and Diamond Streets; Lot 046 in Assessor's Block 6555 (District 8) – Request for **Discretionary Review** of Planning Application No. 2024-000521PRJ for the demolition of a one-story over basement single family house and new construction of a three-story over basement, two-unit building within a RH-2 (Residential-House, Two Family) Zoning District and 40-X Height and Bulk District. The Planning Department found that the project is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The Commission's action constitutes the Approval Action for the project for the purposes of CEQA, pursuant to San Francisco Administrative Code Section [31.04\(h\)](#).
Preliminary Recommendation: Take Discretionary Review and Approve with Modifications
 (Continued from Regular hearing on November 14, 2024)
(Proposed for Continuance to January 16, 2025)

SPEAKERS: None
 ACTION: Continued to January 16, 2025
 AYES: Campbell, McGarry, Williams, Braun, Imperial, Moore, So
 NAYS: None
 ABSENT: None

3. 2019-015062CUA-02 (M. CHANDLER: (628) 652-7340)
500 LAGUNA STREET – east side between Linden and Fell Street; Lot 016 in Assessor's Block 0818 (District 5) – Request for **Conditional Use Authorization** Pursuant to Planning Code Section 303 to modify existing conditions of approval pertaining to the project Validity, Expiration, and Renewal for the Conditional Use Authorization, authorized under Motion No. 20627, by extending their validity by two years. Motion No. 20627 authorized a 1,335 square foot Cannabis Retail Use located at the ground floor of an existing three-story mixed-use building, within the Hayes-Gough NCT (Neighborhood Commercial Transit) Zoning District, and 40-X Height and Bulk District. No changes are proposed to the previously approved project.
(Proposed for Continuance to February 6, 2025)

SPEAKERS: Chris Calloway – Continuance
 ACTION: Continued to February 6, 2025
 AYES: Campbell, McGarry, Williams, Braun, Imperial, Moore, So
 NAYS: None
 ABSENT: None

4. 2019-017622ENV (R. SHUM: (628) 652-7542)
570 MARKET STREET – north side between Sutter Street and Montgomery Street; Lot 013 in Assessor's Block 0291 (District 3) – **Appeal of Preliminary Mitigated Negative Declaration** for the proposed demolition of the existing two-story-over-basement buildings and construction of a 29-story, approximately 300-foot-tall building for hotel uses. The new building would provide approximately 3,400 gross square feet of retail space on the ground floor and mezzanine levels fronting Market Street and an approximately 123,000-

square-foot hotel space that would accommodate approximately 210 guest rooms. The project site is in a C-3-O (Downtown Office) Zoning District and 300-S Height and Bulk District.

Preliminary Recommendation: Uphold Preliminary Mitigated Negative Declaration

(Proposed for Continuance to February 27, 2025)

SPEAKERS: None
 ACTION: Continued to February 27, 2025
 AYES: Campbell, McGarry, Williams, Braun, Imperial, Moore, So
 NAYS: None
 ABSENT: None

5a. 2019-017622DNX (J. VIMR: (628) 652-7319)

570 MARKET STREET – north side between Sutter Street and Montgomery Street; Lot 013 in Assessor's Block 0291 (District 3) – Request for **Downtown Large Project Authorization** pursuant to Planning Code Sections 309 with exception from requirements for interior lot setbacks under Section 132.1, for off-street freight loading spaces under Sections 152.1 and 161, and for off-street tour bus loading spaces under Section 162 to allow the construction of a 29-story, approximately 300-foot-tall building for hotel uses. The new building would provide approximately 3,400 gross square feet of retail space on the ground floor and mezzanine levels fronting Market Street and an approximately 123,000-square-foot hotel space that would accommodate approximately 210 guest rooms. The project site is in a C-3-O (Downtown Office) Zoning District and 300-S Height and Bulk District. The Planning Department issued a preliminary mitigated negative declaration pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The Commission's action constitutes the Approval Action for the project for the purposes of CEQA, pursuant to San Francisco Administrative Code Section [31.04\(h\)](#).

Preliminary Recommendation: Approve with Conditions

(Proposed for Continuance to February 27, 2025)

SPEAKERS: None
 ACTION: Continued to February 27, 2025
 AYES: Campbell, McGarry, Williams, Braun, Imperial, Moore, So
 NAYS: None
 ABSENT: None

5b. 2019-017622CUA (J. VIMR: (628) 652-7319)

570 MARKET STREET – north side between Sutter Street and Montgomery Street; Lot 013 in Assessor's Block 0291 (District 3) – Request for **Conditional Use Authorization** pursuant to Planning Code Sections 210.2 and 303, to allow the construction of a 29-story, approximately 300-foot-tall building for hotel uses. The new building would provide approximately 3,400 gross square feet of retail space on the ground floor and mezzanine levels fronting Market Street and an approximately 123,000-square-foot hotel space that would accommodate approximately 210 guest rooms. The project site is in a C-3-O (Downtown Office) Zoning District and 300-S Height and Bulk District.

Preliminary Recommendation: Approve with Conditions

(Proposed for Continuance to February 27, 2025)

SPEAKERS: None
 ACTION: Continued to February 27, 2025
 AYES: Campbell, McGarry, Williams, Braun, Imperial, Moore, So
 NAYS: None
 ABSENT: None

6. 2024-003394CUA (C. ALEXANDER: (628) 652-7334)

32-34 BLAKE STREET – eastside between Geary Boulevard and Euclid Avenue; Lot 013 in Assessor's Block 1068 (District 2) – Request for **Conditional Use Authorization** pursuant to Planning Code Sections 209.1, 303,

and 317, for the removal of an Unauthorized Dwelling Unit (UDU) located at the ground floor of an existing three-story, two-unit residential building, within a RH-2 (Residential-House, Two Family) Zoning District, Family and Senior Housing Opportunity SUD (Special Use District), and 40-X Height and Bulk District. The Planning Department found that the project is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The Commission's action constitutes the Approval Action for the project for the purposes of CEQA, pursuant to San Francisco Administrative Code Section [31.04\(h\)](#).

(Continued from Regular hearing on October 24, 2024)

(Proposed for Indefinite Continuance)

SPEAKERS: None
 ACTION: Continued Indefinitely
 AYES: Campbell, McGarry, Williams, Braun, Imperial, Moore, So
 NAYS: None
 ABSENT: None

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. 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.

7. [2024-006235CUA](#) (K. BOTN: (628) 652-7311)
301 JUNIPERO SERRA BOULEVARD – southeast corner of Ocean Avenue; Lot 001A in Assessor's Block 6901 (District 7) – Request for **Conditional Use Authorization**, pursuant to Planning Code Section 303, 303.1 and 710 to convert an existing ground floor space (previously occupied by "Citibank"), measuring approximately 3,749 square feet in floor area, to a Formula Retail Instructional Service use (d.b.a. Russian School of Mathematics). The use will provide instructional educational services for pre-K and K through 8th grade students. The proposal will involve ground floor interior tenant improvements. There will be no expansion of the existing building envelope. The project site is located within a NC-1 (Neighborhood Commercial, Cluster) Zoning District and 26-X Height and Bulk District. The Planning Department found that the project is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The Commission's action constitutes the Approval Action for the project for the purposes of CEQA, pursuant to San Francisco Administrative Code Section [31.04\(h\)](#).
Preliminary Recommendation: Approve With Conditions

SPEAKERS: None
 ACTION: Approved with Conditions
 AYES: Campbell, McGarry, Williams, Braun, Imperial, Moore, So
 NAYS: None
 ABSENT: None
 MOTION: [21659](#)

C. COMMISSION MATTERS

9. LAND ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Commissioner Braun:

The Planning Commission acknowledges that we are on the unceded ancestral homeland of the Ramaytush Ohlone, who are the original inhabitants of the San Francisco Peninsula. As the indigenous stewards of this land and in accordance with their traditions, the Ramaytush Ohlone have never ceded, lost, nor forgotten their responsibilities as the caretakers of this place, as well as for all peoples who reside in their traditional territory. As guests, we recognize that we benefit from living and working on their traditional homeland. We wish to pay our respects by acknowledging the ancestors, elders, and relatives of the Ramaytush Ohlone community and by affirming their sovereign rights as first peoples.

10. COMMISSION COMMENTS/QUESTIONS

Commissioner Williams:

Thank you. I just want to wish everyone a happy holidays. Take this time, we're gonna, this is our last meeting before the holiday break so happy holidays to everyone and thank you for everything you do.

President So:

Happy Holidays. I would like to make an announcement today. This is to follow up back in the October 17, 2024 meeting, we heard and received community letters regarding to a DR item on our agenda at the location of 2588 Mission Street. After the community had voiced their concerns about that project and with a very thorough deliberations, myself and also my fellow Commissioner Williams met with the community and have a lot more conversations with our city staff and city attorney. I would like to use my discretion to form a, to host a offsite meeting of a subcommittee to listen to our community. And I would like to take this opportunity to appoint two members of our Commission, Commissioner Williams and Commissioner Campbell. And we would like to have this community hearing to take place as early as in January. The exact time and place will be provided in the future. Oh yeah, I'm also appointing myself. Thank you, Jonas.

Commissioner Williams:

Thank you, Chair So. I just wanted to acknowledge and thank you and everyone who is going to participate, my two commissioners. This is a very important issue for the Mission community and I just, I really appreciate your thoughtfulness and your consideration because you know, considering I am from that community. So, I really just want to say thank you.

President So:

Thank you.

D. DEPARTMENT MATTERS

11. DIRECTOR'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

None.

12. 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.

Like you, the land use committee had their last meeting of the year this week, and also the last land use committee for Supervisors Peskin and Preston.

241055 Building, Planning Codes - Code Corrections and Updates. Sponsor: Planning Commission. Staff: Starr.

The first item was this commissions' code corrections ordinance. Commissioners you heard this item on September 19 and voted to recommend approval with modifications. All but one of the proposed modifications were additional clean-up items, and they were all added to a revised ordinance prior to transmittal to the Clerk's office. The one amendment not added was suggested at the last minute by a member of the public. It dealt with allowable uses in conjunction with Self Storage in the PDR-2 zoning. This commission stated that they were not opposed to the amendment but that the language needed to be worked out with staff. You then left it up to the Land Use Committee to integrate the amendment at the committee hearing.

During the hearing, Supervisor Peskin stated that he wanted to add the amendments. To accommodate this and to allow for the original ordinance to move forward, Peskin duplicated the ordinance and amended it. The original file was then forwarded to the Full Board with a positive recommendation as a committee report.

241103 Planning Code - Landmark Designation - Ladies' Protection and Relief Society (3400 Laguna Street). Sponsor: Peskin. Staff: LaValley.

Next the land use committee considered the landmark designation of Ladies' Protection and Relief Society building at 3400 Laguna Street. This building is eligible for landmark designation because it is significant for association with the Ladies' Protection and Relief Society, San Francisco's second oldest charitable organization and the first established by and for women. Furthermore, the main building, constructed in 1925 by renowned architect Julia Morgan, is an excellent, rare, and well-preserved example of a commercial building designed in the Jacobethan Revival style by an architect of merit.

During the land use committee, there were two speakers in favor of the proposed designation. There was little discussion with the committee members and the designation was unanimously recommended to the Full Board.

240641 Planning Code - Laboratory Uses in the Urban Mixed Use Zoning District. Sponsors: Walton. Staff: V. Flores.

Next the Committee took up Supervisor Walton's ordinance that prohibits Laboratory uses in the UMU zoning district.

Commissioners, you heard this on August 1st and adopted a recommendation for disapproval. During deliberations, you raised concerns about the impacts the proposed Ordinance would have on PDR uses and districts. You also expressed concerns regarding the vacancy rate and the potential loss of jobs, especially the diversity of jobs associated with Laboratories.

During the land use hearing, Supervisor Walton stated that the intent of the Ordinance was to ensure the UMU districts truly serve as a mixed use district and allow more opportunities for active uses and affordable housing in the district.

There were a handful of public comments in support of the proposed Ordinance, including from the Potrero Boosters and Dogpatch Neighborhood Association. There were also a handful of public comments in opposition to the proposed Ordinance, including from the Chamber of Commerce.

Supervisor Melgar suggested moving this forward to the full Board without recommendation.

Supervisor Peskin stated that he understood the Ordinance to be a clarification of the now repealed Life Science and Medical Special Use District. Supervisor Walton echoed this and further emphasized that the goal was not to overburden the neighborhood community with Life Science uses.

Supervisor Walton shared that he intends to introduce amendments to the legislation on December 17th to include a grandfathering clause for 700 Indiana Street and General Plan findings.

The Committee moved this Ordinance forward with recommendation, with Supervisor Melgar voting no. Just to note because the Board needs to override this commission's GP inconsistency findings, it needs a supermajority to pass.

240872 Planning Code, Zoning Map - 30 Van Ness Avenue Special Use District; Amendment of Agreement for Sale of Real Estate. Sponsors: Mayor; Dorsey. Staff: Giacomucci.

Next the Committee took up the proposed SUD at 30 Van Ness. This item had been continued several times. This week Supervisor Peskin made a motion to amend the ordinance to subject the proposed project to project specific inclusionary requirements in Section 415. The project sponsor was not in favor of this amendment, as they were seeking credit for the fees already paid to the city so that the project would be financially feasible. Requiring inclusionary units on top of the fees already paid would maintain the projects infeasibility. Supervisor Melgar voted no on the proposed amendments and voted no on the motion to forward the item to the full board with recommendation. However, both Preston and Peskin voted yes.

230596 Planning Code - Minimum Densities for Residential Projects in RM, RC, and RTO Districts. Sponsors: Peskin. Staff: Merlone.

Finally, the Committee unanimously passed with recommendation Supervisor Peskin's ordinance to require minimum densities in the RM, RC, and RTO zoning districts. This item had been amended last week and had to be continued because the amendments were substantive.

Full Board

[240879](#) Planning Code - 524 and 530 Howard Street - Transit Center District Open Space Impact Fee Waiver for 524 Howard Street, LLC. Sponsor: Dorsey. Staff: Merlone. PASSED Second Read

[240931](#) Planning Code, Zoning Map - 2301 Chestnut Street Special Sign District. Sponsor: Dorsey. Passed First Read

[230596](#) Planning Code - Minimum Densities for Residential Projects in RM, RC, and RTO Districts. Sponsors: Peskin. Staff: Merlone. Passed First Read

[241055](#) Building, Planning Codes - Code Corrections and Updates. Sponsor: Planning Commission. Staff: Starr. Passed First Read

[241103](#) Planning Code - Landmark Designation - Ladies' Protection and Relief Society (3400 Laguna Street). Sponsor: Peskin. Staff: LaValley. Passed First Read

Corey Teague, Zoning Administrator:

Good afternoon and happy holidays, President So and Commissioners, Corey Teague, Zoning Administrator. I am going to give a little bit of a catch-up report from some Board of Appeals cases over the last month or so. The first is, was an appeal of, actually a Letter of Determination that I had issued. I don't typically report on those but this one was related to procedural technicalities that do impact how the Planning Commission reviews Cannabis Retail Uses. The request was specifically for 500 Laguna Street but the question was a universal question and it really had to do with whether or not the Planning Code prohibits the Planning Commission from considering more than one Cannabis Retail proposal within a 600-foot radius at a time. As you may know the Planning Code does prohibit the establishment of more than one Cannabis Retail Use within a 600-foot radius but a Conditional Use Authorization is the front-end entitlement. You know, it's not fully established until you go to the full building permit process and establish that use. And essentially the outcome to that in my determination was that the Planning Code does not prohibit, especially the Planning Commission, from considering two or more Conditional Use Authorization applications for Cannabis Retail within the same radius.

However, the Planning Code does specifically prohibit the Department from accepting and processing such applications unless we get a referral from the Office of Cannabis. So separately the Office of Cannabis, through their own code, went to a public rule making process in 2019 on how they would consider and process their applications considering the buffer rules where they very specifically and purposely do not refer applications to our Department when there is an active application within that 600 foot buffer. So, the outcome of that determination essentially was that the code doesn't prohibit the Planning Commission from considering them but effectively because of the rules that the Office of Cannabis had put in place, that won't happen unless their rules change because we won't receive a Cannabis second application within 600 feet as long as there is an active application already. So that was appealed and, you know, there was a very robust conversation about the procedure technicalities at the Board but ultimately they did unanimously uphold the determination and denied that appeal.

Then moving on to 1819 Fulton Street, you may recall this project has been before you twice, first as a Conditional Use Authorization several years ago and then this past March as a Discretionary Review (DR). This was a large mid-block interior lot parcel with a small strip of land that connected the Fulton Street. The proposal was to build four dwelling units within that. It was originally before you as Conditional Use (CU) because the density triggered the Conditional Use requirement. You granted that Conditional Use, the board on appeal, had taken that down to two units instead of four. Subsequently with the Constraints Reduction Ordinance and the Four Plex Ordinance, that project did not require the CU, it came back again, the building permits were DR'd so it came before you. That was before you this past March. You again approved that project for the four dwelling units on that interior lot. Those permits were appealed, that's what was at the Board of Appeals. There was again a very robust and interesting conversation about life, safety and egress and what not but ultimately the Board did uphold the permits. They made one minor change that the applicant was completely okay with which was simply to move the location of the entry gate further in because it just open the width of that door a little bit more for safety purposes just to provide a wider doorway since that would be the only access point in and out. It is a very minor change but ultimately, they upheld the project as it was proposed and that was also a unanimous vote.

Separately the project at 700 Indiana Street, this was a Large Project Authorization that you approved in July of this year for the new construction of a laboratory building and that Large Project Authorization was appealed to the Board of Appeals, and that was scheduled and continued multiple times. It was actually

scheduled to be heard last night but that was withdrawn because the appeal was withdrawn because the appellants and the project sponsor came to an agreement. My understanding is that the project will add a modest amount of retail space on the ground floor or where there hadn't been in the original project. So that was withdrawn and not heard by the Board and will move forward.

And then lastly there was a project before you earlier this year, multiple hearings but you made a decision in April this year for 4000 21st Street. This was an expansion of a single-family home subject to the central neighborhood's Large Residence Special Use District and the Commission had required the addition of an ADU, a second unit, so they had come back and they had done that. The immediate rear property owner neighbor had opposed it but ultimately after plans were slightly amended that Conditional Use Authorization was approved. The project had later on to receive a different permit to do some related but not the primary work in the rear to do some excavation and add some features in the rear immediately adjacent to their rear neighbors. They appealed that permit or actually, to be clear, they did not appeal the permit, the request was for a jurisdiction request to be able to appeal it because it was after the appeal period. So there was some interesting conversation. Some of the board members felt that there are some scenarios where we are not required to notify neighbors of permits being issued and they don't know that they can appeal it and we should notify neighbors more but ultimately, they recognize that is not the process we have now and there are some permits that simply they do not require notification and can be approved over the counter. And so they did deny that appeal unanimously so that project should also be moving forward. But that's all I have today. Thank you.

E. GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT

SPEAKERS: Georgia Schuttish – Section 317 never implemented as intended because Tantamount to Demolition Demo Calcs in Section 317 (b) (2) (B) and Section 317 (b) (2) (C) never adjusted. When Exemption Section 317 (d) (3) (A) was eliminated by legislation in the Spring of 2020, Department contended: "...Section 317 does not serve its intended goals of retaining relatively affordable housing stock, nor does it necessarily result in projects that are more in-keeping with neighborhood character". Before Exemption was eliminated, was adjusted five times over ten years due to increase in housing prices due speculation. Never the Calcs. Soundness Exemption in Section 317. How many Soundness Reports past 10.5 years? New Exemptions added to Section 317 under legislation from outgoing Mayor, Section 317 still grants legislative authority to Commission to adjust Demo Calcs to "further the efficacy of Section 317" as stated on Department documents. Housing for Residents of PEGs neighborhoods needs protection/preservation.

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.

8. [2024-007308DNX](#) (M. LANGLEIE: (628) 652-7410)
555 PINE AND 430 BUSH STREETS – south side between Grant Avenue and Kearny Street; Lots 039-040 in Assessor's Block 0270 (District 3)/north side between Grant Avenue and Kearny Street; Lot 037 in Assessor's Block 0270 (District 3) – Request for **Downtown Large Project Authorization** pursuant to Planning Code Sections 263.8 and 309, to permit an exemption to the 80 foot height limit up to 130 feet in a C-3-R (Downtown-Retail) Zoning District and 80-130-F Height and Bulk District. This will allow for the installation of a 28-foot-tall rooftop generator and associated screening, reaching an overall height of 129 feet and 1 inch. The generator will be located on the roof of 430 Bush Street with connecting pipes to serve 555 Pine Street. The Planning Department found that the project is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The Commission's 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: = Michelle Langlie – Staff report
 + Speaker – Project sponsor presentation
 ACTION: After being pulled off of Consent; Approved with Conditions
 AYES: Campbell, McGarry, Williams, Braun, Imperial, So
 NAYS: Moore
 ABSENT: None
 MOTION: [21660](#)

13. [2024-010322PCA](#) (V. FLORES: (628) 652-7525)

INTERIM HOUSING IN HOTELS AND MOTELS [BF 240932] – Planning and Building Code Amendments – An ordinance, sponsored by Mayor Breed, to amend the Planning Code to allow tourist hotels and motels to be used for Interim Housing without thereby abandoning or discontinuing the hotel use classification under that Code; amending the Building Code to allow Interim Housing without thereby changing the underlying occupancy classification of the property, and amending Appendix P to remove restriction that emergency housing be located on land owned or leased by the City; affirming the Planning Department’s determination under the California Environmental Quality Act; and making findings of consistency with the General Plan, and the eight priority policies of Planning Code, Section 101.1, and findings of public necessity, convenience, and welfare under Planning Code, Section 302.

Preliminary Recommendation: Adopt a Recommendation for Approval

SPEAKERS: = Veronica Flores – Staff report
 + Emily Cohen, Department of Homelessness – Introduction to ordinance
 - Randy Shaw – Lack of outreach with the neighborhood, continue
 + Simon Sin – Hotel owner, hotel amenities
 + Cedric – Provides necessary shelter
 + Breanna Morales, HAC – Address homelessness equitability
 = Austin Yang, CAT – Response to comments and questions
 ACTION: Adopted a Recommendation for Approval with anticipated amendments to include relocation efforts.
 AYES: Campbell, McGarry, Braun, So
 NAYS: Williams, Imperial, Moore
 ABSENT: None
 RESOLUTION: [21661](#)

14. [2024-007228CRV](#) (V. FLORES: (628) 652-7525)

DELEGATION OF AUTHORITY TO MODIFY CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL RELATING TO AFFORDABLE PRICE AND INCOME LIMITS FOR CERTAIN BELOW MARKET RATE OWNED UNITS – Request for consideration of the **Adoption of Delegation of Authority** to the Planning Director to Modify the Conditions of Approval, Conditions on a Project Permit, or Notice of Special Restrictions Related to the Affordable Price and Income Limits for Certain Below Market Rate Owned Units, pursuant to the administrative modification procedures and requirements in Planning Code Section 415.8(b)(9), provided such procedures and requirements are duly enacted by law.

Preliminary Recommendation: Adopt

SPEAKERS: = Veronica Flores – Staff report
 + Breanna Morales, HAC – Helps speed up housing production
 = Aaron Starr – Response to comments and questions
 = Rich Hillis – Response to comments and questions
 ACTION: Adopted
 AYES: Campbell, McGarry, Williams, Braun, So
 NAYS: Imperial, Moore
 ABSENT: None

RESOLUTION: [21662](#)

15. [2024-008952PCA](#) (L. LANGLOIS: (628) 652-7472)
DEVELOPMENT IMPACT FEES AND REQUIREMENTS FOR NON-RESIDENTIAL TO RESIDENTIAL CONVERSION PROJECTS [BOARD FILE NO. 240927] – Planning Code Amendment – Ordinance introduced by Mayor Breed and Supervisor Dorsey, amending the Planning Code to exempt certain types of projects in the downtown area that replace non-residential uses with residential uses from development impact fees and requirements, including the Inclusionary Housing fee; to create a process for previously approved projects to request modification to conditions of approval related to development impact fees, subject to delegation by the Planning Commission; and to remove the application deadline from the Commercial to Residential Adaptive Reuse Program; affirming the Planning Department’s determination under the California Environmental Quality Act; making findings of consistency with the General Plan, and the eight priority policies of Planning Code, Section 101.1; and making findings of public necessity, convenience, and welfare pursuant to Planning Code, Section 302.
Preliminary Recommendation: Approve with Modifications
 (Continued from Regular hearing on November 21, 2024)
[Disclosure from Commissioner Campbell 2:26:26 – 2:27:08](#)

SPEAKERS: = Lily Langlois – Staff presentation
 + Jacob Bintliff, OEWD – Introduction to ordinance
 + Jackson Nutt-Beers, SF Chamber of Commerce – Housing opportunities
 + James Stallworth, Groundstone – Affordable housing fee
 + Marc Babsin, Emerald Fund – Could help projects converted and get people downtown
 + Dan Fedder, Wilson Meany – Revitalize downtown
 + Erika McLitus, SPUR – Will help create workforce housing
 + Breanna Morales, HAC – Key to bringing back vibrancy to the area
 + Lisa Fullman – Revitalization of downtown
 + Jack Sylvan, SDG – Essential policy
 + Mark – Current conditions, empty office buildings, break ins
 - Charlie Sciammas, CCHO – Eliminates the affordable housing requirement
 = Corey Teague – Response to comments and questions
 = Sheila Nickolopoulos, MYR – Response to comments and questions
 = Rich Hillis – Response to comments and questions
ACTION: Adopted a Recommendation for Approval with Staff Modifications Nos. 1 and 3, recommending that the TAC include this in their work program.
AYES: Campbell, McGarry, Braun, Moore, So
NAYS: Williams, Imperial
ABSENT: None
RESOLUTION: [21663](#)

16. [2023-010283CUA](#) (J. SACCHI: (628) 652-7308)
216 MONTANA STREET – north side between Faxon and Capitol Avenues; Lot 009 in Assessor’s Block 7055A (District 11) – Request for **Conditional Use Authorization** pursuant to Planning Code Sections 209.1, 249.3, 303, and 317 to allow the demolition of an existing 2,549 square foot single-family dwelling and new construction of two new three-story, two-unit residential buildings. Each of the proposed residential buildings includes approximately 2,900 square foot, five-bedroom primary dwelling unit, and an approximately 1,100 square foot, two-bedroom Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU). The Project site is located within a RH-1 (Residential-House, One Family) Zoning District, Oceanview Large Residence and Priority Equity Geographies SUD (Special Use Districts), and 40-X Height and Bulk District. The Planning Department found that the project is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The Commission’s action constitutes the Approval Action for the project for the purposes of CEQA, pursuant to San Francisco Administrative Code Section [31.04\(h\)](#).

Preliminary Recommendation: Approve with Conditions
(Continued from Regular hearing on November 7, 2024)

SPEAKERS: = Joseph Sacchi – Staff report
+ Alex Nie – Project sponsor presentation
- Hyun Woo – Concerns with light and view from their windows
= Elizabeth Watty – Response to comments and questions

ACTION: Approved with Conditions

AYES: Campbell, McGarry, Williams, Braun, Imperial, Moore, So

NAYS: None

ABSENT: None

MOTION: [21664](#)

- 17a. [2015-006356CUA](#) (M. DITO: (628) 652-7358)
336 PIERCE STREET – east side between Oak and Page Streets; Lot 020 in Assessor’s Block 0844 (District 5) – Request for **Revocation** of the Conditional Use Authorization contained in Planning Commission Motion No. 20510 and granted on August 19, 2019. The proposed revocation is pursuant to the Conditions of Approval contained in Planning Commission Motion No. 20510. The subject property is located within a RM-1 (Residential, Mixed – Low-Density) Zoning District, Family Housing Opportunity SUD (Special Use District), and 40-X Height and Bulk District. Revocation would not result in any physical changes to the subject property.
Preliminary Recommendation: Revoke

SPEAKERS: = Matt Dito – Staff report
+ Behruz Vahdani – Project sponsor presentation

ACTION: Revoked

AYES: Campbell, Williams, Braun, Imperial, Moore, So

NAYS: None

ABSENT: McGarry

MOTION: [21665](#)

- 17b. [2015-006356CUA-02](#) (M. DITO: (628) 652-7358)
336 PIERCE STREET – east side between Oak and Page Streets; Lot 020 in Assessor’s Block 0844 (District 5) – Request for **Conditional Use Authorization** pursuant to Planning Code Sections 303 and 317 to remove an Unauthorized Dwelling Unit (UDU) at the rear of the subject property. The UDU was in an accessory rear yard structure that has been demolished and partially rebuilt. The project proposes to remove the partially rebuilt structure. The UDU will not be replaced. The project seeks to abate Planning Enforcement Case No. 2015-005370ENF. The subject property is located within a RM-1 (Residential, Mixed – Low-Density) Zoning District, Family Housing Opportunity SUD (Special Use District), and 40-X Height and Bulk District. The Planning Department found that the project is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The Commission’s 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 17a.

ACTION: Approved with Conditions

AYES: Campbell, Williams, Braun, Imperial, Moore, So

NAYS: None

ABSENT: McGarry

MOTION: [21666](#)

ADJOURNMENT 3:50 PM

ADOPTED JANUARY 9, 2025