

SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING COMMISSION

Meeting Minutes

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

Thursday, January 16, 2025
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 12:06 PM

STAFF IN ATTENDANCE: Aaron Starr, Carla De Mesa, Lisa Gibson, Richard Sucre, David Winslow, Miriam Chion – Director of Community Equity, Rachael Tanner – Director of Citywide Planning, 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. 2024-007142CRV (M. GIACOMUCCI: (628) 652-7414)
1035 HOWARD STREET – south side between Russ Street and Harriet Street; Lot 094 in Assessor's Block 3731 (District 6) – Resolution **Approving** a waiver of the Active Use requirements of Planning Code Section 145.1(c)(3) to allow less than 25 feet of Active Use at the ground floor and less than 15 feet at upper floors as part of a project that would include 1,540 gross square feet of Social Services Use, 23,911 gross square feet (gsf) of Self-Storage Use, and 43,996 gsf of Commercial Storage (a PDR use). Pursuant to Planning Code Section 145.1(d)(1),

the Planning Commission may waive or modify certain street frontage requirements for historic buildings when the Historic Preservation Commission advises that the proposed project would enhance the feasibility of preserving the subject property. The Project was heard at the Historic Preservation Commission on December 4. The Project is located within a MUG (Mixed Use-General) Zoning District and 65-X, 85-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

(Continued from Regular hearing on December 5, 2024)

(Proposed for Continuance to January 23, 2025)

SPEAKERS: None
ACTION: Continued to January 23, 2025
AYES: Campbell, McGarry, Williams, Braun, Imperial, Moore, So
NAYS: None
ABSENT: None

2. 2023-011398CUA (K. AGNIHOTRI: (628) 652-7454)
1111 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE – southwest corner of 25th Street; Lot 015 in Assessor's Block 4291 (District 10) – Request for **Conditional Use Authorization** pursuant to Planning Code Sections 210.3 and 303 to establish fleet charging use with a total of fifty-two (52) charging spaces, within the two existing surface lots, within a PDR-2 (Production, Distribution, And Repair) Zoning District and 65-J 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

(Proposed for Continuance to February 13, 2025)

SPEAKERS: None
ACTION: Continued to February 13, 2025
AYES: Campbell, McGarry, Williams, Braun, Imperial, Moore, So
NAYS: None
ABSENT: None

3. 2023-009469DRP (D. WINSLOW: (628) 652-7335)
77 BROAD STREET – south side between Plymouth and San Jose Avenues; Lot 014A in Assessor's Block 7112 (District 11) – Request for **Discretionary Review** of Building Permit Application No. 2023.0629.1225 for the construction of a two-story horizontal and vertical addition to add two dwelling units to a two-story, 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: Do Not Take Discretionary Review and Approve

(Continued from Regular hearing on November 21, 2024)

(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

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.

4. [2024-007818CUA](#) (J. VIMR: (628) 652-7319)
 2740-2744 MISSION STREET – west side between 23rd and 24th Streets; Lot 005 in Assessor's Block 3643 (District 9) – Request for **Conditional Use Authorization** pursuant to Planning Code Sections 121.2, 178, 303, 303.1, and 754, to allow an existing Limited Restaurant and Formula Retail use (dba "Pollo Campero") to expand into an adjacent, vacant commercial space within the same building (a commercial storefront merger) alongside associated exterior and interior improvements. The use size would increase from 3,759 to 6,326 square feet overall. The subject property is located within the Mission NCT (Neighborhood Commercial Transit) Zoning District and 80-B Height and Bulk District. It is also outside of, but directly adjacent to the Calle 24 Latino Cultural 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: [21670](#)

C. COMMISSION MATTERS

5. 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.

6. COMMISSION COMMENTS/QUESTIONS

President So:

So, I would like to address one of the letter that we had received a couple of days ago from Supervisor Walton's office in regard to the project at 4100 3rd Street. It was a CU hearing and I think that, there are some of my fellow Commissioners have some comments and some of them had already reached out to Supervisor's office. Before opening up the floor for our fellow Commissioners' comments I would like to see if Director Watty would like to give us some explanations or respond to the letter from Supervisor Walton.

Elizabeth Watty, Director of Current Planning:

Sure I'm happy to, and just to note Director Hillis will be here in a moment but he's just in a meeting running a few minutes late but happy to share a few clarifying points. There's been a lot of I think correspondence of the Commission's been looped in since last week's hearing on 4100 03rd Street and I wanted to make a couple of things super clear. First, staff of the Planning Department did not send any letters from local electives or

community leaders to the Commission on that project and it's our understanding that the sponsor also did not send any such letters to the Commissioners. Now I can't speak to everything that you guys receive but certainly those that have kind of come transmitted through us and we've asked the sponsor and that's my understanding. We do have the letters that have been referenced in the project file but staff very explicitly did not forward them because they were not about this project. So we have them in our file, they were submitted to the Department staff, but there was actually an email exchange between the Project Planner, Gaby, and the project sponsor saying "Hey thanks for these. They don't reference the project address. We'll keep them in the file. Do you have anything for this project address?" So there was a very sort of intentional understanding about what those letters were about.

Secondly, the Commissioners did receive a two and a half three-page brief from the executive director of the Friends of the Children the night before the hearing that made mention of receiving a grant and that they received support for that grant from local electives and community leaders. I've reread that letter. I have a copy here if anyone wants to take a peek at it, but it's crystal clear in that letter that there's no graying of support. It's very clear that support was about the grant and there was no inference to the CU before you. It's worth noting that it's also not unusual for the Department to receive letters particularly for social service type projects or philanthropic or institutional uses. Receiving letters that are effectively you know, like character witnesses of the organization that just sort of speak to the good the organization does for the community, it's really typical for us to get that. We often even see it here in the chambers where people aren't so much talking about the CU findings or even the question that you guys have to make but more just about the good of the organization.

So for us it certainly didn't raise any red flags to receive those types of letters. You know, it's all sort of part of the background of understanding what this organization is and why they're requesting, you know, to be in this community. And so, but we also understand as I just mentioned, the distinction between that versus a support letter for this project.

Nonetheless, I can also understand that if someone did not have a chance to read the letter that was forwarded to you guys at about 8 PM the night before which is not a reasonable expectation to have the Commission have to read something that comes in so late, that if you hadn't read that letter before walking into the Commission Chambers and you were just sort of generally listening audibly to the to the conversation from the sponsor during their presentation, you might have drawn an inference or assumed that support for the grant equated to support for the CU. And I absolutely can empathize and understand how that happened. I did want to make sure I rewatched the video to make sure there wasn't any falsehoods presented and that the words were exactly what they should have been about support was for the grant and I can confirm that. I truly listened to it back about 20 times and wrote down every word and it was all about the letters we received were for the grant. And so I can confirm that from watching the video.

All of this though is to say I think we can always take a couple of lessons learned from every experience that has blown up. By no means do we, you know, we very much take to heart the, clearly the Supervisor's Office was very upset by those inferences that they felt were made and I think we can do better to try to put some protocols in place so that kind of thing doesn't happen in the future. So I've let staff know to really make sure we go above and beyond particularly when elected officials or you know, senior members of the community provide correspondence that we take that extra moment to really delineate and almost go above and beyond to call out exactly what we got and exactly what the content of the letters were. We've gotten a way of trying to sort of reiterate what people's letters of support are because in the past it's always been a little tricky to say, you know, we got 100 letters of support, let us describe what each and every one of them said to you all. But I think especially when it comes to that subset of the population that is meaningful when they show their support for projects to you all that we're going to take a little extra effort to really delineate that moving forward to you all and I think we can do, you know, better job to make sure that you're not getting critical information from sponsors the night before a hearing.

I understand that that's a real pressure on you guys and difficult so we're going to work to really make sure that we get those incorporated into the packet so you've got your full week to read everything and have time to ask those questions. So I just wanted to get that out on the record, you know, apologize in advance to the Supervisors Office if there was anything that we could have done differently and that we'll, we'll handle things a bit differently in the future. But all of this is to say I don't think there was any sort of untruthfulness actually presented or any sort of malfeasance or intent of being deceptive in any of the communication. And so I just wanted to make sure we, we kind of got that out there for you, all of you. Thank you.

President So:
Thank you.

Commissioner Imperial:

Thank you, President So, for first addressing it, for bringing it up, and Ms. Watty for all the explanation and clarification. And yes, I do agree with you as well Ms. Watty that in terms of the protocols we do need to, you know, we're talking about a district that is always kind of like left behind, the Bayview, and needs more resources and more support. So you know, I think that this is definitely a learning lesson and I also hold myself accountable in that perhaps I, you know, as a Commissioner, should have also questioned more deeply in terms of the intent of the letter as well. So definitely this is a big learning lesson for me personally and yeah and this is something that I think moving forward in the Bayview Hunters Point area there needs to be more critical eye you know critical eye point of view in terms of looking into the support for particular project or plans.

I also want to bring up because SOMA Pilipinas Cultural Heritage District reached out to me actually this week that again in terms I believe during the SF Railyard hearing, Commissioner Williams asked a question to the, to staff whether SOMA Pilipinas is part of the Railyard working group and apparently SOMA Pilipinas contacted me and saw, you know, watching the recorded hearing and informed me that SOMA Pilipinas is not part of the SF Railyard working group. And so that was something also whether it needs more clarification and also you know clarification and you know for me personally if the staff does not know or does not know the whole you know not I'm not assuming that all staff will be knowledgeable in all of the things that especially for that project because a lot of things going on I do encourage us to be transparent that you know something that they have not thought of or something in progress and so you know, it does you know, for a community to kind of reach out and said that they are also being a represent-- or they feel like they're being misrepresented you know, I kind of want to recognize that and also, you know, to follow up in terms of the progress of the SF Railyard working group. So I just want to, you know, comment on that and be and perhaps I will also follow up personally for the working group on that. So thank you.

Commissioner Williams:

This was, I was going to have this question for Planning Director Hillis but Ms. Watty, since you're, since you're here and we're talking about the letter from Supervisor Walton, I get concerned just for the sensitivity of the use of that building at 41 03rd Street mentoring children from the Bayview. When the supervisor writes a letter and questions some of the comments made by the project sponsor that's concerning to me. He's also African American. There's predominantly African American children in the Bayview Hunters Point and so that's a concerning that's a concerning thing to me and I'm just wondering if it's worth a second look and what options do we have as a Commission moving forward on this on this issue?

Elizabeth Watty, Director of Current Planning:

I might defer that to Jonas if he can kind of walk through what that protocol would be.

Jonas P. Ionin, Commission Secretary:

Sure. I'll say first of all that this is not on our agenda so we're beginning to get into a bit of a discussion. But just to clarify the options you have associated with I'll just speak in general maybe not to maybe the particular project but if the Planning Commission receives any evidence of misleading information that has been submitted as part of the application, you can under Section 303 under Conditional Uses, Conditional Use Abatement request that the matter be brought back before you by a majority vote of the Commission. So, it would require four votes of this Commission to bring back something that you feel there is enough evidence to suggest that there was misleading information presented as part of your review and then you would rehear the matter. It could be brought up as a revocation hearing to revoke your previous approval or your previous disapproval for that matter and take action however you see fit. Okay. Just a gentle reminder that the project is not on your agenda today for discussion. You can speak in general terms about things but --

Commissioner Williams:

So to me I think this requires some further discussion. I don't know how others feel about this but I think there's some, some questions and I don't want to get too far into it about you know, how we can make sure that this

doesn't happen again. And I know that some of that has to do with Planning and who's working with the Bayview Hunters Point neighborhood from Planning. I think there's some, you know, there's not enough communication and support for the Bayview. I'm concerned about all of that stuff.

Elizabeth Watty, Director of Current Planning:

Absolutely. And I'll just say just since this is a great platform, our Bayview CAC, Community Advisory Committee, that we staff, actually our manager who oversees the Bayview neighborhood in the current Planning division staffs the Bayview CAC, just informed us that they've lost quorum because somebody quit the Bayview CAC. Obviously, the Bayview CAC is a really important forum to be able to vet development projects and the idea is to you know have all of the different public projects that are happening get vetted, their development projects that are vetted it's a really important forum and they've just lost quorum. So if anyone also knows of anyone within the community who wants to sit on that Bayview CAC, we would love to help put them in touch with the folks who do the appointments process. But I think that a) is a really critical component of getting representation and voices from the collective community heard because typically projects go to the Bayview CAC before they come to the Planning Commission you know projects of size. So I think that's one thing that I think would be really, really helpful. We've been teetering on not having a quorum for a long time and we just officially hit not having a quorum.

And then secondly, yes, I think internally as staff, we do need to and I've because it's not my division I'm not quite as in the weeds with our Community Equity divisions staffing right now for the Bayview but I do think we lost our last full time person who was working on the bay-- specifically on the Bayview and I don't know what the current coverage is right now on that team. But I've also again learning lessons here I think from all of this of the last week I've been working with our the manager who reports directly to me responsible in this area to really make sure they're having weekly communications with the Supervisors' Office as it relates to development projects at least so that there is a lot of sort of advanced notice about what's coming up, what's going on, what projects are coming in, what's up on the agenda and the next week or two weeks so that at least those you know, nothing's getting lost in the shuffle as it relates to that. But I hear your point about sort of the larger Community Equity division making sure that we've got folks sort of in the community, part of the community from our Department, but I couldn't miss the opportunity for the plug for the Bayview CAC because we need to get some people on that so we can make quorum.

Commissioner Williams:

I got you. You know I'd like to you know, put something forward to continue this conversation so I'm not sure if that's to agendize this matter for you know next week or another week. I think it rises to that level.

President So:

Certainly. Commissioner Williams, I would like to maybe, perhaps hear all, seems like we all want to say something about this and then we can collectively make a decision to put something on the agenda in the upcoming weeks.

Commissioner Braun:

Thank you. I just want to say first of all, first of all, thank you to the Supervisor's Office and the Supervisor for bringing this concern to our attention and Ms. Watty, I really appreciate your assessment and review of what exactly happened and I agree with that assessment of the situation. You know, I looked through all my correspondence and everything. I didn't see these letters and when the project sponsor submitted their letter to me and the other Commissioners you know, I read it I did not read it as them claiming that there was support from the Supervisor's Office for the project itself but rather for a prior grant application. However I can definitely see how the fact that the that letter of support for the grant application was raised repeatedly could be a confusing issue for anyone who hasn't read the exact wording of what they have sent in the past or to listen to the exact wording of every sentence that they said during the hearing. So you know, I, I agree with the broader sense that it's maybe not appropriate for the sponsor to have so overly emphasized that past support for the grant application. The sponsor did submit a follow up letter in response to the supervisor or in which they, they you know, took responsibility, explained themselves as trying to just indicate general support, but nevertheless it's, it's something that you know, for my part at that hearing I could see how it could be confusing and so I'm

going to hold myself accountable if I see that situation unfolding and try to do a better job of asking questions for clarification about what exactly is being discussed during the hearing. I do like the sort of internal policy change here that's been stated as far as ensuring staff are clear about letters that are received or not received, about whether the letters are directly about the project, and to continue not circulating letters that are not addressed directly to the Commission or directly about the project. So I really appreciate the responsiveness here and it's something I'm just going to continue to keep an eye on myself.

Commissioner McGarry:

I agree with all our all my fellow Commissioners but I would like to say and alleviates Supervisor Walton's office that my vote last week, I did differentiate the difference between a grant and application for a grant and the project. We were here for the project and yes you can twist it but we were still here for the project that was brought forth and basically it is there to look after at-risk youth within the Bayview. So that is what I voted on. If it was twisted or it seems to be twisted in either ways, that was my vote last week but it was it was definitely for the project and to get that place open as quickly as possible so they could serve the community. But if there is, as Commissioner Williams emphasizes there something else I want to know something I want to know what the something else is. I worked out of the Bayview for 28 years just down the road from this and everyone's got my phone number and if there is something untoward or a little odd, I'd like to know about it. But otherwise we're here for the project and that's what I voted on last week. So thank you.

Commissioner Moore:

I think was one of the most difficult weeks I ever had thinking that something [inaudible] slipped our attention and sometimes it's so subtle that we don't even notice that it really means something slightly different. And I did appreciate Ms. Watty really in the most sensitive way and thoroughly take apart what we actually went through thinking that we had everything and it was really enforcing it gave us like buoyance to support the project. Guess what? So there's one essential thing we did not ask the right question that there's a difference between a grant and a full support for a project and that is where I personally felt that my racial and social equity lens was not quite as focused or as quite up. I've realized that there was perhaps something not quite accurate and again I embraced the letter of support which I never got I never got even a notification that there was something else and said okay, there is something we can hang our hat on and believe it's really the thing we need to support and unfortunately it came out a little differently.

I want to acknowledge and recognize Ms. Watty for the sensitivity by which she for me has instilled great trust in the thoroughness of the Department and I say that very honestly because again to repeat, you taking it apart for every aspect of what you do and what we trust you do, there's no doubt in my mind that the Department has little or nothing to do with this but it's a kind of like a domino effect of things that over the course of 2 or 3 years just basically went unobserved. I would support an ongoing discussion for us specific to the project but generally to how we improve and ourselves participate with more awareness, ask questions before we even meet and call the planner, "is there something missing here?" just to ensure ourselves that everything is soundproof and ready to go. I want to leave it with that supporting an ongoing discussion and thank everybody for just standing up for what happened last week.

President So:

Thank you very much, Vice President Moore. I really appreciate everyone actually give such a serious thought about this and it is very important that as a Planning Department we need to recognize and do culturally an equitable outreach that's not just to the community but also to our Supervisors' Office. And in this regard, I had a conversation with Supervisor Walton. Is he supportive of this organization mission? Yes, no doubt. He is supportive of this organization's mission to help uplift youth in the Bayview and Hunters Point. But had he felt personally been mis-represented? Absolutely. So in this regard I am with my fellow Commissioner that we'd like to continue to have some candid dialog either to agenda item to, to talk about how our Department already have a really robust communication protocol established with our supervisors and the project sponsors but can there be room for improvement? Absolutely, right? So, let's reconvene and think about what will be the most effective way to continue to address and improve among ourselves so then we can foster a better communication and trust between project sponsors, the Supervisor's Office and our Department staff.

And also, I had to comment on what Commissioner Imperial mentioned regarding to the 4th Street railyards;

misrepresentation is by no means really importantly we do not encourage. So I would like to say moving forward including our staff or even specifically project sponsors when you're in doubt, to ask a questions about who have you outreached, have you talked to a specific group, if you actually wasn't sure, please just state that you need more time to check and get back to us so then we can avoid the snowball effect from continuing it. And then, yeah, we would like to take that opportunity to advertise the Bayview CAC definitely need your help to represent. If you do live in that district and you have an interest to serve and represent your community, so make sure that your voice are being heard, please reach out to Liz Watty. And thank you and my fellow Commissioner Imperial, you would like to have a closing statement on this?

Commissioner Imperial:

No, I actually have clarification President So on in terms of bringing having, having this particular agenda is in the future calendar, just wondering, whether are we talking about the project in itself or in terms of general communication relation for any project start coming in to Bayview? I just want that clarification.

President So:

Well, I have been following up with everybody's concern. It sound like it's more of about the communications moving forward of how we can hold ourselves more diligent and be able to discern over when all these materials come in front of us, maybe perhaps make a point of when should the staff actually eliminate unnecessary confusion information that come in front of us so that will give us a much more fair approach to the project.

Elizabeth Watty, Director of Current Planning:

Absolutely. And maybe if I can make a suggestion on that if that's sort of the direction that folks are looking in, you know, we are always looking at ways for, you know, striking that fine balance between sort of streamlining our packets and the information that we provide to you. And so big part of that is public commentary while also not streamlining out the important things. And it is a delicate balance because we very much recognize if we send you guys a 60-page staff report it's really difficult to get through every nuance detail every week when that's multiplied by several projects and so it's a constant sort of balance that we're doing. I would certainly love if there is a you know, subset of you all that are really interested in you know, making sure that the information that we put in our staff reports is accessible to the different types of communities that's culturally competent like the way we write our staff reports to make sure people kind of get it because there is a lot of jargon, there is a lot of technical information and so it's a little more than just the communication with communities, but I do think it all leads back to how are we talking about development projects and making sure that people are understanding but then also we're relaying people's understandings about the projects to you all accurately. So if that is sort of interest and maybe sort of strikes the interest of what you guys are kind of getting at here, I would be more than happy to, you know, not have it be we don't need to do a subcommittee that you know, if there is a non-quorum quantity of you that are especially interested in this I'm happy to set up offline some separate time to have conversations with you on what you think could be improved as it relates to like our packets and our all of that stuff.

President So:

Commissioner Williams, you wanted to weigh in on this?

Commissioner Williams:

Yeah, I just want to bring up that I'd like to hear from the supervisor himself and have him have some input on how we move forward. So I'm not exactly sure how we do that but I think that's an important thing that we haven't really talked about.

Elizabeth Watty, Director of Current Planning:

I mean I think we can absolutely commit, I think what one of the takeaways from this is that we need to sit down face to face with the Supervisor's Office and establish a very clear strategy for communication moving forward to make sure that there are no minced words, everyone's aware of projects. We understand their department or their, their offices take on a project, right? All of those things I think we feel like we've tried but I've absolutely heard that there may be some disconnects. And so I think that's probably a next step. I don't think that needs

to take place in these chambers. I think that's probably a better conversation for our office to have with them to figure out how we can improve communications moving forward. So we absolutely can commit to doing that.

Commissioner Moore:

I would also ask if we are expanding the discussion of fellow Commissioners as well as Ms. Watty. I would like the city attorney to advise us generally of procedural matters and very clear define parameters in which that conversation can be generic and if anybody has a need for it to be project specific to advise us of how we should do that. This is a novelty. I have only been once involved in a vote which was actually rescinded within an hour or two but we have never really had discovery and potentially somebody felt well we need to relook at the project and I'm not saying that we should do that, but I would like generically to understand from city attorney of what uncharted waters we would get ourselves into.

Austin Yang, Deputy City Attorney:

Sure. Deputy City Attorney, Austin Yang. As the secretary mentioned, there are provisions in the Planning Code section 303 that provide for reconsideration or abatement of a conditional use criteria for that includes falsehoods or I don't have a section in front of me but misrepresentations. The Commission can only modify or rescind a previously approved Conditional Use through the same mechanism so you would have to agendize and notice the exact same type of action and provide an opportunity to reconsider the Conditional Use that you had previously approved. And you know as a reminder this would be about the use of the property as Commissioner McGarry mentioned. You know, sort of separate and aside from anything about a grant, you know, this would be about legitimately the proposed use that was in front of the Commission last week. If you wanted to consider more generally, you wouldn't be bound necessarily by the Conditional Use limitations and you could have a broader discussion sort of as you been having here but you know I think that as Ms. Watty has articulated you know, I think there's been a lot of feedback for the Department to take back and to consider and maybe report back at a future meeting.

Commissioner Moore:

Thank you.

Commissioner Williams:

I'd like to put forward a motion to rehear the CU.

Austin Yang, Deputy City Attorney:

I would defer to Secretary but I believe that the time for future matters is in 1 or 2 agenda items.

Jonas P. Ionin, Commission Secretary:

Well we're still on item six for Commission Comments and Questions which includes future meetings but I would need to hear a second to, from another member of the Commission to even call a vote.

Commissioner Moore

I personally would have to have our discussions first and ground myself a little bit more in all aspects that come into play here including speaking to the supervisor himself to give us a little bit more guidance about the background of this project. This project came completely new to us. It had support in another location. Why did you support it then and now it's not so there's a whole bunch of intricacies that I don't want to skip over in order to make a responsible decision to hear it or not. And again it's ultimately about land use, land use so layered and with the proper facts that constitutes a full background to the project. [Inaudible]

Commissioner Moore:

Commissioners, I'm going to caution this body one more time that we've reached a level of discussion on a specific topic that is not agendized. If you wish to agendize a general topic or even a specific topic to have a more in-depth conversation about this, I suggest we agendize it for the next hearing or future hearing after staff maybe meets with the officers to have a conversation, but we've reached a level of discussion on a topic that is not on your agenda today.

President So:

So, may I suggest we will put this as an agenda to continue to discuss this topic next week? Would it be, oh Commissioner McGarry, would you like to say something?

Commissioner McGarry:

So, I need to be clear on this. Is there is there an objection to this body's advancing this last week? The project as a whole. The project is not being I'm not hearing that's an objection to our decision last week. What I'm hearing is that there might be an informational or an interpretation of information how it's coming but nothing about the project itself. Has the project by Supervisor Walton's office as Supervisor Walton's office objected to to us putting this advancing this—

Jonas P. Ionin, Commission Secretary:

Commissioners I'm going to again caution that this this item is not on your agenda today for discussion and if you would like to discuss this matter, I suggest you put it on the agenda next week or for future hearing.

Commissioner McGarry:

There's a motion I just want to make sure that the motion actually lines up with what we're actually –

Jonas P. Ionin, Commission Secretary:

The motion I believe is to schedule the Conditional Use Authorization for the project to be reconsidered by the Planning Commission.

Commissioner Moore:

No.

President So:

No,

Jonas P. Ionin, Commission Secretary:

That was what the motion was made. I did not hear a second.

Commissioner Williams:

I'll rescind that motion—

President So:

Okay.

Commissioner Williams:

If you're willing to make a motion to continue –

President So:

Yeah. I think now we're going to have a new motion is to put this particular topic to continue for our Commission discussion for next week. Not necessarily bring back the project yet.

Jonas P. Ionin, Commission Secretary:

Understood.

President So:

We need more time.

Rich Hillis, Planning Director:

[inaudible] So we'll put it on the calendar

President So:
Okay.

Rich Hillis, Planning Director:
We want an info item on it.

Jonas P. Ionin, Commission Secretary:
Right. There seems to be consensus from the –

Rich Hillis, Planning Director:
an information?

Commissioner Williams:
Do we need to second it?

President So:
We don't need to second it.

Commissioner Williams:
Okay.

Rich Hillis, Planning Director:
I mean I guess I'm trying to--

President So:
Director Hillis.

Rich Hillis, Planning Director:
Yeah. thank you. Sorry. I don't know. I wasn't here for the discussion so you may want to have a motion to –

President So:
and see maybe there are –

Rich Hillis, Planning Director:
[inaudible]

Elizabeth Watty, Director of Current Planning:
Perhaps maybe we can just be crystal clear. It sounded like there was a motion to, you know, schedule a resumption for the project and we could not get a second.

Jonas P. Ionin, Commission Secretary:
Correct.

Elizabeth Watty, Director of Current Planning:
We then have conversation that we want to have a larger conversation about the Department's communication strategies, particularly in the Bayview and how those can be improved in the future and it sounded like there was interest of further that conversation around how we can improve communications, make sure things like this don't happen in the future etc. In the abstract, not specific to this project, is that correct?

President So:
I think maybe [inaudible] incorrect here that after that debriefing some of my Commissioner might, would like to keep that opportunity to, to be able to rescind the CU.

Commissioner Moore:

I thought I said we wanted to get more input, direct input from Supervisor Walton's office if there's anything we missed.

President So:

Right.

Commissioner Moore:

To better understand why this was in the first place. Without any [inaudible]

Elizabeth Watty, Director of Current Planning:

So, you're saying if we missed any land use?

Commissioner Moore:

[inaudible] anything just is basically informative open up to discussion what did we miss hearing from you and that is kind of like all I want to do. That does not mean that that automatically means that I'm trying to tee it up for rescinding, whatever the word is, and I just believe we need to have that that openness.

Rich Hillis, Planning Director:

And maybe if I could suggest one alternative path is and this won't happen tomorrow or next week but similar to the meetings we've had on the Mission in the Mission although there was a Mission Action Plan, in the Tenderloin there was a Tenderloin Action Plan, you know we can schedule a hearing on kind of Third Street In The Bayview. We can talk about the CHESS report that's happening to the cultural district. So, there could be a hearing just broadly about that Bayview, some of the projects that are happening within the broader neighborhood like the Shipyard and Candlestick and certainly this could be a topic we talk about. We'd want time to prep for that but similar to other neighborhoods where we've had a hearing about kind of issues perhaps things you want to see happen, we can do that as well.

Commissioner Imperial:

Just want to chime in. Yes, I think there let's start with a broad topic where, and we've had we've done this before where there's a broad topic and we ended up also mentioning particular projects for that. So, I don't see it different, and we can also again invite the supervisor in that in that conversation too. But you know for me I'd like to see in terms of the broad pattern the broad one in what we're what's the Planning Department doing in terms of the Bayview Hunters Point neighborhood and also you know how are we actually improving those communication relation, the outreach, the community engagement that we're doing the Bayview, I mean there's a lot of things to cover in the Bayview Hunters Point, the Bayview CAC at the same time too. So, I'd like to start with a broad one and of course we can discuss this particular topic about 4100 Third Street and site that as an example. I'd like to see it in that way how we do the hearing but yeah.

President So:

Okay.

7. ELECTION OF OFFICERS – In accordance with the Rules and Regulations of the San Francisco Planning Commission, the President and Vice President of the Commission shall be elected at the first Regular Meeting of the Commission held on or after the 15th day of January of each year, or at a subsequent meeting, the date which shall be fixed by the Commission at the first Regular Meeting on or after the 15th day of January each year.

| | |
|-----------|---|
| SPEAKERS: | None |
| ACTION: | President - So; Vice President - Moore |
| AYES: | Campbell, McGarry, Williams, Braun, Imperial, Moore, So |
| NAYS: | None |
| ABSENT: | None |

D. DEPARTMENT MATTERS

8. DIRECTOR'S ANNOUNCEMENTS
None.
9. 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.

241111 Hearing - Appeal of Determination of Exemption From Environmental Review - Proposed 1719 Wallace Avenue Project

I wanted to start off by updating you on an CEQA appeal that happened last year before the winter recess. On December 17, the Board of Supervisors heard a CEQA appeal of a categorical exemption for a project at 1719 Wallace Avenue.

Commissioner's you originally heard this as a CU on October 10, 2024, and approved the conditional use application.

The project would allow the establishment of an industrial agriculture use for the purpose of cannabis cultivation in an existing, one-story industrial building within the PDR-1-B Zoning District.

The appellant was filed by Barbara Tassa, a neighbor. Several individuals spoke in favor of the appeal. Following the public comment period, Supervisor Walton introduced a motion to deny the appeal and affirm the categorical exemption, which was seconded by Supervisor Preston.

The vote passed with 9 to 0, with Supervisor Chan excused.

The temporary Committee assignments for the land use committee came out last week and include Supervisor Melgar as the chair, Supervisor Mahmod, and Supervisor Fielder. We should now the permanent members by next week, but I believe most if not all the temporary committee members will remain.

240903 Planning Code - Health Service Uses in West Portal Neighborhood Commercial District. Sponsor: Melgar. Staff: Merlone.

This week the land use committee considered Supervisor Melgar's ordinance that would allow Health Service Uses to exceed the maximum use size on one parcel in West Portal Neighborhood Commercial District.

Commissioners, you heard this on December 5, 2024, and adopted a recommendation for approval.

At the hearing, Supervisor Melgar indicated her openness to working on a more holistic approach to this issue, as was recommended by Planning Staff, but that there was a need to get this ordinance passed ASAP. Supervisor Mahmod indicated he would support the ordinance given it's the time sensitive nature, but that he would have preferred seeing a more holistic approach.

There were no public commentors, and the Committee voted to forward the time to the full board with a positive recommendation.

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.

At the Full Board this week, the Board considered the 30-Van Ness SUD for its second read; however instead of passing it on second read, Supervisor Dorsey propose amendments that would change the required inclusionary rates to match the rates in Planning Code Section 415. The amendments made by Supervisor Peskin at the Land Use Committee last year included inclusionary rates slightly higher than the standard

rates. The amendments were passed unanimously, and the amended ordinance then passed on first read unanimously.

Jonas P. Ionin, Commission Secretary:

I have no report from the Board of Appeals but the Historic Perseveration Commission did meet in these chambers yesterday. They considered several Legacy Business Registry applications. The first was for Cha Cha Cha on 1801 Haight Street; the Golden Gate Park Band on 75 Hagiwara Tea Garden Drive; City Optic at 2154 Chestnut Street; and the San Francisco Flower Mart on 16th Street where they adopted Recommendation for Approval for all four of those applications. Further, they heard the North Beach National Register Historic District. They received a lot of positive support, as well as frustration, I think, from impacted property owners that there was not any outreach performed. I would only say that the National Historic District nomination was prepared by a private consultant and submitted to the State of California Office of Historic Preservation. In our capacity as a certified local government, the City and County is only afforded a 60-day window to review, so this was not our application that was put forward or a district that was being proposed by the Planning Department or Historic Preservation Commission, so, provided us with very limited time to review even. This will be heard on February 7th of this year and all comments due to the State by January 31st, 2025. Finally, they considered the project, I shouldn't say they considered the project, they considered the preservation alternatives for the CEQA document at 530 Sansome and 447 Battery Street, which is a recognizable landmark in San Francisco. Their conversation surrounded concern about establishing precedent of rescinding landmark status by ordinance and how that might impact other landmarks in the future because that was what the project would afford but their purview was the preservation alternatives.

E. GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT

SPEAKERS: None

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.

10. [2020-0096400TH](#) (C. DE MESA: (628) 652-7476)
RACIAL AND SOCIAL EQUITY ACTION PLAN – Informational Presentation – Staff will provide the Commission with an update on the Department's Racial and Social Equity Action Plan ("Equity Plan"), highlighting key accomplishments and progress since its Phase 1 adoption in 2019. The update will also introduce two new focus areas—Equitable Planning and Community Engagement—which complete the development of the Equity Plan. Staff will seek feedback on the alignment of proposed strategies with the Department's equity goals, additional areas for prioritization, and considerations to ensure the plan's implementation is actionable and measurable. The updated Equity Plan, incorporating Commission feedback, will return for adoption at a future hearing in Spring 2025.

Preliminary Recommendation: None – Informational

SPEAKERS: = Carla De Mesa – Staff presentation
 + Del Seymour, Code Tenderloin – Tenderloin District
 + Mary Travis-Allen – American Indian Cultural District
 + William Ortiz Cartajena – Mission District
 + Majeid Crawford, New Leadership Foundation – Fillmore District
 + Mahsa Hakimi – Castro LGBTQ Cultural District
 + Raquel Redondiez, SOMA Pilipinas – Filipino Cultural Heritage District
 + Chevonne – Segregated diversity, importance of culture and family
 + Tyree – Celebrate the Tenderloin
 + Dennis – Tenderloin
 = Miriam Chion – Response to comments and questions

= Rachael Tanner – Response to comments and questions
 = Rich Hillis – Response to comments and questions
 = Lisa Gibson – Response to comments and questions
 = Rich Sucre – Response to comments and questions
 = Liz Watty – Response to comments and questions

ACTION: Reviewed and Commented

11. [2024-011329PPS](#)

1474 SOUTH VAN NESS AVENUE – west side of between 25th and 26th Streets; Lot 011 in Assessor's Block 6527 (District 9) – **Informational Presentation** for the proposed construction of a housing development project pursuant to Government Code Section 65913.4 (SB 423), in an area subject to Government Code section 65913.4(q). The project consists of demolishing two existing residential buildings, containing two dwelling units, and relocating a portion of the front facade fronting on South Van Ness Avenue. The project would construct a new six-story residential building with eight dwelling units and a two-story single-family home for a total of nine dwelling units. The project sponsor submitted a notice of intent to construct the project on December 17, 2024. After the hearing and upon completion of tribal consultation, a formal application may be submitted following the project sponsor's review of any public testimony and written comments from the hearing.

Preliminary Recommendation: None – Informational

SPEAKERS: + Riyad Ghannam – Project sponsor presentation
 - Barbara Heffernan, Neighborhood SF – Concern to heights and density
 + Brianna Morales, HAC – Positive change
 - Richard Kurylo – State laws
 = Rich Hillis – Response to comments and questions

ACTION: Reviewed and Commented

G. DISCRETIONARY REVIEW CALENDAR

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

12. [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 December 12, 2024)

SPEAKERS: = David Winslow – Staff report
 - Scott Emblidge – DR presentation
 + Marian – Project sponsor presentation
 - Brian Elliot – Size and bulk, light and privacy is still an issue
 - Tom Dunworth – Size is out of scale
 - Speaker – Scale and neighborhood impact, privacy, misuse of zoning rules
 = Austin Yang, Deputy City Attorney – Response to comments and questions

ACTION: Took DR and Approved with Staff modifications

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

NAYS: McGarry
ABSENT: None
DRA: [865](#)

ADJOURNMENT 4:28 PM

ADOPTED FEBRUARY 6, 2025