

SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING COMMISSION

Meeting Minutes

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

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

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

THE MEETING WAS CALLED TO ORDER BY VICE PRESIDENT MOORE AT 12:12 PM

STAFF IN ATTENDANCE: Mathew Snyder, Rachael Tanner, 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. 2023-007428DRP-02 (D. WINSLOW: (628) 652-7335)
428 COLLINGWOOD STREET – west side between 21st and 22nd Streets; Lot 006 in Assessor's Block 2769 (District 8) – Request for **Discretionary Review** of Planning Application No. 2023-007428PRJ for the construction of a 683 square foot 4th-story vertical addition to a three-story single-family residential building to an existing three-story, one-family house 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

(Proposed for Continuance to September 19, 2024)

SPEAKERS: None
 ACTION: Continued to October 10, 2024
 AYES: Campbell, McGarry, So, Williams, Braun, Imperial, Moore
 NAYS: None

2. 2023-009219CUA (D. SPYCHER: (628) 652-7588)
842 CALIFORNIA STREET – north side between Powell and Joice Streets; Lot 027 in Assessor's Block 0243 (District 3) – Request for **Conditional Use Authorization**, pursuant to Planning Code Sections 303 and 317, to demolish four existing buildings, consisting of five dwelling units and two commercial spaces, for the construction of a new eight-story, approximately 89-foot tall, 40,949 gross square foot, residential building with 33 dwelling units, including five permanently affordable replacement dwelling units, within a RM-4 (Residential- Mixed, High Density) Zoning District, Priority Equity Geographies SUD (Special Use District), and 65-A Height and Bulk District. The project is utilizing the Individually Requested State Density Bonus Program pursuant to Planning Code Section 206.6 and California Government Code Section 65915, to achieve up to a 6.45 percent bonus and is seeking waivers from development standards for Front Setback (Section 132), Rear Yard (Section 134), Exposure (Section 140), and Height (Section 250). 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\(h\)](#).
(Proposed for Continuance to September 26, 2024)

SPEAKERS: None
 ACTION: Continued to September 26, 2024
 AYES: Campbell, McGarry, So, Williams, Braun, Imperial, Moore
 NAYS: None

3. 2019-022850CUA-02 (C. FEENEY: (628) 652-7313)
1101-1123 SUTTER STREET – south side between Larkin and Polk Streets; Lots 001 and 019 in Assessor's Block 0692 (District 3) – Request to modify **Conditional Use Authorization** that was approved by the Planning Commission on March 24, 2022 through Motions No. 21091 and 21092 by 1) modifying the previously approved Conditional Use Authorization as a Pipeline Project, pursuant to Planning Code Section 415A, to reduce the On-Site Affordable Housing rate to 12% and the Affordable Housing Fee rate to 16.4%; 2) modifying the previously approved Conditional Use Authorization by extending the performance period; and 3) making Findings under the Individually Requested State Density Bonus Program (Sec. 206.6), pursuant to California Government Code Section 65915, to achieve a 64.67% density bonus, requesting seven waivers for rear yard (Sec. 134), residential open space (Sec. 135), above-grade parking setback (Sec. 145), off-street loading (Sec. 152), height (Sec. 260), narrow streets and alleys (Sec. 261.1), and bulk (Sec. 270); and two incentives/concessions for non-residential use size limits (Sec. 121.2) and restrictions of lot mergers (Sec. 121.7). The revised project proposes the demolition of a surface parking lot and an existing two-story commercial building at 1123 Sutter Street and construction of a new 22-story, 235-foot-tall building that will provide 303 rental dwelling units. On June 11, 2024, the Planning Department issued an addendum to the previously certified EIR that evaluates the potential environmental effects of the revised project compared to the impacts identified in the final EIR. The Project is within the Polk Street NCD (Neighborhood Commercial District), Priority Equity Geographies SUD (Special Use District), and 130-E and 65-A Height and Bulk Districts.

Preliminary Recommendation: Approve with Conditions

(Proposed for Continuance to October 10, 2024)

SPEAKERS: None
 ACTION: Continued to October 10, 2024

AYES: Campbell, McGarry, So, Williams, Braun, Imperial, Moore
 NAYS: None

4. 2024-004178CUA (M. DONG: (628) 652-7426)
5214 DIAMOND HEIGHTS BOULEVARD – south side between Duncan Street and Gold Mine Drive; Lot 006 in Assessor's Block 7521 (District 8) – Request for **Conditional Use Authorization** pursuant to Planning Code Sections 202.12, 303, 303.1, and 713, to remove a Laundromat use and establish a Formula Retail Gym use (d.ba. Club Pilates), in an existing one-story, commercial building in the Diamond Heights Shopping Center within a NC-S (Neighborhood Commercial, Shopping Center) 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: Approve with Conditions
(Proposed for Continuance to October 17, 2024)

SPEAKERS: None
 ACTION: Continued to October 17, 2024
 AYES: Campbell, McGarry, So, Williams, Braun, Imperial, Moore
 NAYS: None

5. 2024-006170PCA (V. FLORES: (628) 652-7525)
1896 PACIFIC AVENUE – NEW ROOFTOP FLOOR AREA OR BUILDING VOLUME ON NONCOMPLYING STRUCTURE – **Planning Code Amendments** – An ordinance, sponsored by Supervisor Stefani, to amend the Planning Code to permit new floor area or building volume on the rooftop of a noncomplying structure located at 1896 Pacific Avenue, on Assessor's Parcel Block No. 0576, Lot Nos. 27-44; affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act; making public necessity, convenience, and welfare findings under Planning Code, Section 302; and making findings of consistency with the General Plan, and the eight priority policies of Planning Code, Section 101.1.
(Proposed for Indefinite Continuance)

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

17. [2021-003547CUA](#) (G. GUNTHER: (628) 652-7607)
243 STAPLES AVENUE – south side between Foerster Street and Edna Street; Lot 042 in Assessor's Block 3157 (District 7) – Request for **Conditional Use Authorization**, pursuant to Planning Code Sections 209.1, 303, and 317, to allow the demolition of an existing one-story over basement single-family dwelling and new construction of an approximately 7,243 square foot, three-story over basement single-family dwelling within a RH-1 (Residential- House, One Family) Zoning District, Family and Senior Housing Opportunity SUD (Special Use District), and 40-X Height and Bulk District. The Project would abate Planning Enforcement Case No. 2022-007652ENF. 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: Georgia Schuttish – Take a look at the site
 ACTION: Continued to November 7, 2024
 AYES: Campbell, McGarry, So, Williams, Braun, Imperial, Moore
 NAYS: 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.

6. [2024-002223CUA](#) (M. LANGLEIE: (628) 652-7410)
1326 GRANT AVENUE – east side between Green and Vallejo Streets; Lot 028 in Assessor's Block 0132 (District 3)
– Request for **Conditional Use Authorization** pursuant to Planning Code Sections 174, 178, 303, 722 and 780.3 to amend the conditions of approval number 3 from Planning Commission Motion No. 14933 (Case No. 1999.485C) to add amplified live entertainment and to extend the permitted hours of entertainment between noon and 1:30 am daily at an existing Bar use (dba Legacy North Beach Bar) located within the North Beach NCD (Neighborhood Commercial District), North Beach SUD (Special Use District) and 40-X Height and Bulk District.
Preliminary Recommendation: Approve with Conditions

SPEAKERS: None
ACTION: Approved with Conditions
AYES: Campbell, McGarry, So, Williams, Braun, Imperial, Moore
NAYS: None
MOTION: [21603](#)

7. [2024-001608CUA](#) (H. MONTANO: (628) 652-7402)
391 SUTTER STREET – southeast corner of between Stockton Street; Lot 015 in Assessor's Block 0294 (District 3)
– Request for **Conditional Use Authorization** pursuant to Planning Code Sections 210.2 and 303, to establish a massage establishment (d.b.a. House of Rejuvenate Massage), within an existing space on the 8th floor of an existing eight-story mixed-use building, 391 Sutter Street, within the C-3-R (Downtown Retail) Zoning District and 80-130-F Height and Bulk District. There will be no expansion of the existing building envelope. 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, So, Williams, Braun, Imperial, Moore
NAYS: None
MOTION: [21604](#)

8. [2024-001899CUA](#) (D. SPYCHER: (628) 652-7588)
1657 POWELL STREET – west side between Union and Green Streets; Lot 002 in Assessor's Block 0118 (District 3)
– Request for **Conditional Use Authorization** pursuant to Planning Code Sections 303, 722, and 780.3, to permanently establish a Liquor Store use (d.b.a. Coit Liquors) within 1,678 square feet of ground floor commercial space within the North Beach NCD (Neighborhood Commercial District) Zoning District, North Beach SUD (Special Use District), and 40-X Height and Bulk District. The business was displaced from its original location at 585 Columbus Avenue in 2018, due to a fire, and was granted Temporary Use Authorization to operate at the subject property. The Project proposes to legalize minor storefront alterations. 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, So, Williams, Braun, Imperial, Moore
 NAYS: None
 MOTION: [21605](#)

9. [2024-004781CUA](#) (A. LINDSAY: (628) 652-7360)
1457 HAIGHT STREET – south side between Ashbury Street and Masonic Avenue; Lot 027 in Assessor's Block 1244 (District 5) – Request for **Conditional Use Authorization**, pursuant to Planning Code Section 303, 719, and 781.9 to change an existing Limited Restaurant to a Restaurant on the ground floor at 1457 Haight Street within the Haight Street NCD (Neighborhood Commercial District) Zoning District and 40-X Height and Bulk District. Project is only to memorialize the change of use and no construction is proposed. 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, So, Williams, Braun, Imperial, Moore
 NAYS: None
 MOTION: [21606](#)

C. COMMISSION MATTERS

10. 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.

11. CONSIDERATION OF ADOPTION:

- [Draft Minutes for July 25, 2024](#)
- [Draft Minutes for August 1, 2024](#)

SPEAKERS: None
 ACTION: Adopted
 AYES: Campbell, McGarry, So, Williams, Braun, Imperial, Moore
 NAYS: None

12. COMMISSION COMMENTS/QUESTIONS

Vice President Moore:

I would like to take this opportunity to say hello. Welcome back from a wonderful summer break, and I want to welcome a full commission, particularly our new commissioner, Commissioner Campbell, and our other commissioner who we have only met briefly, Mr. McGarry. I am glad to see a full commission and we are ready to roll up our sleeves and positively enter into the challenges that are ahead of us. Wonderful things are happening. The city looks active, the city looks beautiful. Tourists everywhere doing the kinds of things that a well managed, good looking city does and I can only say it was wonderful to come home and see that there are so many changes that have occurred during those five weeks that we were all away. I want to just expand,

extend the welcome to our new group. We will all be finding our way to work as a successful team, and I see a couple of comments.

Commissioner Imperial:

Thank you. Welcome everyone and welcome, Commissioner Campbell, and I'm looking forward to working with you as well, in the, as the, we have the full Planning Commission. I, I want to follow up on the, on the, on the hearing that I requested last, last July before we went for a vacation. And I just would like to get some sort of follow up with the Planning Department as to what are the steps. And, you know, because I follow up, I requested for hearings for anti-displacement strategies and small businesses that I hope to have in September. But since I know we've had this conversation, but I also want the public to know as to what the Planning Department is doing right now in terms of preparing for that.

Rich Hillis, Planning Director:

Yeah. Happy to answer. Yes, we've agreed we should have hearings on both those issues. As you know, on that on the tenant displacement issue and kind of rent control and how that affects our work, we did have a hearing a couple of months ago. I know there are new commissioners so we're happy to repeat that. And especially a lot of issues have come up as to how these relate to the rezoning. And some of these issues go beyond the rezoning, right. Because issues around tenant displacement and small business retention can happen in areas where slated to rezone, but also areas that we have rezoned or haven't rezoned in the past. So but I think it's important to do that in the context of the rezoning. And those hearings were on the list of things we wanted to tackle as part of that. So I think the short answer is yes. It's just timing that I think we want to get right. And I think you had a conversation with Commissioner Tanner and maybe having a couple community meetings, even before we met to get some more context and understanding about what the public wants to hear. So, yes, you know, unlikely now to happen in September, but as part of the cadence of rezoning hearings that we want to have probably starting later this year, definitely have both a hearing on small business in our strategies around small businesses as well as, tenant protection and, and you know, how that those are local laws work with state laws to retain existing rent-controlled housing stock.

Commissioner Imperial:

So right now, in terms of the planning, kind of like planning for the, you know, for this series of meetings, is there, is there can that be part of a, you know, a report as well in terms of the when are we in terms of these series of my understanding is that there's going to be a series of meetings with different agencies and also organizations as well, or community organizations as well, can we have that some sort of an update?

Rich Hillis, Planning Director:

Yeah, yeah. We can give an update on kind of what our expected timeline is for those series of hearings, because there were issues around Preservation, State Density Bonus, and how state laws, which have recently changed to work with our local laws and how we're proposing they work as part of the rezoning. So there was a list of kind of hearings we wanted to tackle. But what we're happy to send a memo or talk about it here as to what the how we anticipate those rolling out and then you can, happy to get your input on changes you may want to make to [inaudible]

Commissioner Imperial:

A memo or part of the Director's report will be great.

Rich Hillis, Planning Director:

Sure. It could be a memo, and then I'll talk about it. But happy to do that.

Commissioner Imperial:

Thank you.

Vice President Moore:

Before I turn over the microphone to my other fellow commissioners, I want to not be a miss mentioning that has been brought to my attention that commissioners have questions about successorship when a president or

a commissioner leaves by reasons of for personal resignation or others. This is an interesting question that is actually anchored in the rules and regulations that govern this commission. I myself don't have all the answers, but I'm astutely aware that we all share the question of successorship. So I have been talking with Director Hillis and suggesting that we calendar an item on next week's agenda for all of us to discuss our understanding of the rules and get guidance to properly proceed based on those rules that govern this commission.

Commissioner Braun:

Well, first of all, I just want to say welcome to Commissioner Campbell. It's great to have you here. Great to have a full commission in place again. So I am one of those commissioners who's had, you know, some questions, trying to figure out how our rules relate to the situation we've recently found ourselves in, in which the president of the commission that we all collectively, as a commission, voted for as president, departs the commission and whether or not there's that question as raised by Chair Moore about the succession that might occur at that time. And so I, I am curious to hear just at least an introduction to this topic. If the deputy City Attorney has any perspective or analysis of the rules as they relate to this.

Kirsten Jensen, City Attorney:

Thank you, Commissioner Braun. The commission rules provide that upon resignation or unavailability of the president, as you know, the vice president will, as an interim officer, take the place of president. And that's what, of course, has happened. So President Moore has been taking over the role of president for the last number of meetings. The acting president does not, however, have the authority to designate a vice president, for example, so that leaves the commission for some period of time without both of the two elected officers that normally sit in those seats. The commission rules do not specify whether the interim president must preside for the balance of the previous president's term, or only until the next election is held. However, the language in Article 3, Section 2 of the Planning Commission's rules could be interpreted as applying only in temporary absences. In other words, not to be intended for a long-term replacement of an absent president. It's the job of the commission to interpret its rules. So when there is any kind of vague language, the commission is to step in and decide what the language means. Per the Commission Rules, Robert's Rules apply, except where the commission rules specify a different procedure. So although there is some language in Robert's Rules about what happens when there is a succession, those rules only apply when there is not a contrary or superseding provision in the specific Planning Commission rules. So because the Planning Commission's rules could be interpreted in one of two ways, the commission has a couple of options here. The commission could hold an election for the president. And then, depending on the outcome for a vice president, if necessary, or could hold an election only for the vice president seat, which is currently open with the interim president remaining in office until the end of the current term. So it's really up to the commission to interpret its rules and determine which of those two paths is appropriate.

Commissioner Braun:

Okay. Thank you for that. So what I'm hearing is this is a little vague in our rules and at the commission's discretion. Is that a good summary at the end of the day?

Kirsten Jensen, City Attorney:

Yes, it is.

Commissioner Braun:

Okay I mean, I can say that for me, I was not anticipating that there would be the succession. I, you know, I, I say this with the utmost respect to Chair Moore. But for me, as a commissioner, when we had a full hearing and vote on the presidency of this commission, I felt I was electing Commissioner Diamond to that position and did not imagine that you know, for a fairly long period of time, if something should happen with Commissioner Diamond departing, not that I was really thinking about it at the time, but that the role would automatically be filled. And it sounds like it's no wonder I was a little uncertain, because it sounds like our rules are a little unclear, I would just like to have the discussion about this, whether some of it's today and some of it is at the next hearing. But I also, because of the sort of time sensitivity to this in a way, I am also interested in calling a making a motion that we could vote on this at our next hearing and continue the discussion ahead of that vote, potentially.

Vice President Moore:

Commissioner, Secretary Ionin, I think we are moving into a discussion. This item needs to be calendared. The public has a full right to see the commission deliberate on this matter. Particularly, I have the impression that the real wording of the rules and regulations are not totally familiar, including the interpretation. We're getting one interpretation, ultimately, it is the commission themselves who has to carefully scrutinize their own rules. The City Attorney's advisory to us, and I greatly appreciate the depth of their understanding. However, there's institutional memory from the public as well as from myself about the interpretation of the rules. And I would see it as an opportunity for all of us to turn a chapter together. Ultimately, we need to work as a team like it or not. The Election of Officers that is occurring once a year occurs on the 15th of January, and that is the term in which the elected officials, officers are on the commission, and that includes the vice president, whom you voted for also. So I'm not trying to make a case for myself here, but I believe that we owe it to ourselves to be more diligent about our rules and obligations, including the in-depth interpretation what we are voting on. I at this moment do differ in certain points of the City Attorney's interpretation, and I would like us to give ourselves the time to do this together. We have basically approximately 9 or 10 meetings left in this year, and you will, starting with the election process all over again in January. So I basically ask for you to follow the rules that we're not having a discussion or a motion or anything, but that we would be agreeing to have a meeting on the subject matter next week. And then we can move very quickly as soon as we have a common basis of what we are reading and what we are understanding. That would be my direction. I talked with the director about it yesterday. He seemed to be in concurrence, and I think it's one step at a time.

Jonas P. Ionin, Commission Secretary:

Commission Chair Moore, I'll only state that under Commission Comments and questions on the agenda, there's a standing item that future meetings and agendas, that this is the opportunity the commission may discuss and take action to set the date of a special meeting and or determine those items that could be placed on the agenda of the next meeting and other future meetings of the Planning Commission. So it's an appropriate discussion and or action to be had. I'm just just reminding you of what's already sort of a standing line item on your agenda. I will also note this, this topic has come up during the break, and there's been a lot of back and forth. So we went back and took a look at recent history as to what occurred just in the recent past. And --

Vice President Moore:

Secretary Ionin, I am not here to discuss the pros and cons with you of what you have done in the break. I'm simply, simply trying to set a direction for the commission to have a discussion of changes in rule or interpretations of rule be done in an appropriate meeting, and an appropriate setting where each of us, including our brand-new commissioners who most likely have never seen these rules that particular it's hard to find them, finds a way to look at them together and talk about it. That is all I'm asking for. We need to act as a team and that is what we will do.

Jonas P. Ionin, Commission Secretary:

I was just going to remind the commissioner of past precedents that happened a couple of years ago.

Vice President Moore:

I appreciate the detail on that next week when we talk about it, I would greatly appreciate all the detail you have.

Commissioner Braun:

I understand. I would still like to have the conversation next week and also to have the election. If others disagree with me, this motion might fail if others don't. I mean, I haven't even gotten a second. I haven't actually made the motion yet, but, you know, I would move to have the election for president next week and we can continue the discussion then. If people feel I'm way off, you know, out of line here, then they can decide not to have the election if they want to get more information next week instead. Or if, next week they decide that this isn't a reasonable application of rules, then the election could simply confirm the current status quo. So either way, I would like to make a motion to hold the election for president next week.

Jonas P. Ionin, Commission Secretary:
Is there a second?

Commissioner McGarry:
Secretary Ionin, I would second that motion.

Kirsten Jensen, City Attorney:
If I could recommend that the motion be amended slightly so that it's a motion to elect officers so that if there is any change. If there is not any change in the president, you will then also be able to elect a vice president. Because as it stands, you would only be filling the presidential office.

Commissioner Braun:
Yes, that's acceptable to me.

Commissioner McGarry:
Yes, I'd second that. very good. Does the public get to

Commissioner Braun:
Yes, that's acceptable to me.

Commissioner McGarry:
Yes, I'd second that.

Jonas P. Ionin, Commission Secretary:
Very Good.

Commissioner Williams:
Thank you, Commissioner Moore. I just want to, I'd like to say that, so, am I clear that the elections are in January? This coming year?

Jonas P. Ionin, Commission Secretary:
The normal course of elections is held, I believe, on the first hearing after January 15th.

Commissioner Williams:
And that's. And that's when our previous President's commission term was up.

Vice President Moore:
Correct?

Jonas P. Ionin, Commission Secretary:
Correct.

Commissioner Williams:
Okay, so, I mean, I just want to say that it's only a couple of months. It's, three months, and then we're going to have to go through this process again. So I think that it's I'm, I think Commissioner Moore has a tremendous experience and, and she is very well respected. I think she'd make a fine I think she's doing fine where she's at. I think, that we should wait if we want to elect someone new. I think she'd be fine in the interim. And if we want to elect someone, we can wait until January, which is only a few months away. That's what I got to say.

Commissioner McGarry:
In the interests of continuity, I believe we have to have a full contingent and that means a vice president and a president. So for that reason, I second the motion to have an election for a vice president and a president. Thank you.

Commissioner Imperial:

I actually would like, have more conversation this next week. And I'm glad that it will be, as part of the, you know, you made a motion, Commissioner Braun and I respect that in terms of having the election for officers, but I still would like to have this interpretation, the memo or what the city attorney has mentioned is something that I have not read yet in terms of the rules. So that's something that I would like to have as well and then have this really conversation. And for also for me to interpret this rule and also be able to deliberate this as a conversation for next week. You know, in and so I will withhold in terms of like whether we should have full election or the succession until I get that memo from the city attorney.

Kirsten Jensen, City Attorney:

To be clear, there is no memo. I was referring to the Planning Commission's rules, which are available on the website, and Robert's Rules, which are also available on the website.

Commissioner Imperial:

Okay. So well, probably I will have to set a meeting with you then just to be more clear on that interpretation, but I'd rather have a full conversation on this and also have the conversation about the succession in the past and what has happened before, because I feel like there has been a succession in the past before, but maybe I am not, you know, I'm not well versed in the history of the officers, but that can be, you know, something can be discussed with Secretary Ionin on the history of the succession, so that's my take.

Commissioner So:

I really appreciate everyone sitting here and full room of audience. And I really appreciate Commissioner McGarry mentioned that we have now full parties being appointed on this commission. The role of our commission is to help the city run efficiently and as quick as we can. My interest is to help projects move forward, that will move forward for our city. This project that is sitting in front of us, staring at us, we need to work fast together. By that, meaning, I really appreciate commissioner Derek Braun mentioned that we take care of our commission business as carefully and respectfully as we can, but we should spend most of our time looking at the projects. I truly believe that's what made us all to serve here for the city. It's not about ourselves. It's actually what is the best for the city. So that's kind of what I wanted to share. I really appreciate everyone's input.

Vice President Moore:

Thank you so much. Are there additional comments? If not, we can turn to public comment, please.

Jonas P. Ionin, Commission Secretary:

Indeed, as this is turned into an action item, we should open up public comment on this matter. Members of the public, this is your opportunity to address the commission on this matter.

Jonas P. Ionin, Commission Secretary:

Just for the record, I believe that the motion is actually to schedule the Election of Officers next week and that it doesn't preclude you from not holding, having a conversation before you have that. Just a clarification.

Commissioner Braun:

I just wanted to make that clarification as well. I apologize if I wasn't clear about that but the motion is for an election next week, not today.

SPEAKER:	Georgia Schuttish – Discuss it next week so the public can comment
	Francisco DaCosta – Discuss in the right manner
	Sue Hestor – Have it on the agenda next week
ACTION:	Add the Election of Officers to September 19, 2024 agenda
AYES:	Campbell, McGarry, So, Braun, Imperial
NAYS:	Williams, Moore

Vice President Moore:

I'd like to restate my position that I believe until the commission has a full understanding and is thoroughly studied, the rules and regulations, that a vote or a motion to have an election is inappropriate. And I need to put that in there because if there's leadership in the commission, in any commission, it is my responsibility to point out to commissioners who have not been around long enough to understand their responsibilities not under peer pressure but for the mere rules of which we are by the charter appointed to the responsibilities we have. Thank you.

Jonas P. Ionin, Commission Secretary:

Commissioners, if there's no further comments by the commissioners, if you would indulge me for just one moment, I recently learned about a state bill that has been passed and is on the governor's desk to sign and it's, it would affect all of you directly. It's quite interesting. So the bill would actually allow for commissions, commissioners to attend hearings remotely. And so in fact, the way it would apply for this commission is up to seven hearings a year. So it's fairly significant. I think it's to take into account work related travel, illness and whatnot, so that we can still continue the city's business, with a quorum, and so that we don't have to worry about that. So it's a significant change to the state regulation associated with our hearings and processes. And again, if the mayor-- excuse me, the governor decides to sign it within 30 days, it will become effective as of the 1st of January, 2025.

Vice President Moore:

Secretary Ionin, has this been run by the mayor? Because the return to actual hearings was very much strongly based on the good principle that the mayor supports an active civic center environment in which city's business is visible to all. And we are to be here in this room, including the public who want to speak to us.

Jonas P. Ionin, Commission Secretary:

I can't say if the mayor was consulted or has been advised, but I'm sure she'll find out soon enough.

Vice President Moore:

And I really would appreciate it, because I do think that her the advice was sound and has indeed created the activity around city hall and the civic center that we all support.

D. DEPARTMENT MATTERS**13. DIRECTOR'S ANNOUNCEMENTS****Rich Hillis, Planning Director:**

Yeah. No announcements. Welcome Commissioner Campbell and Commissioner McGarry. Oh, just briefly, this morning, I was at the reopening of TransAmerica Pyramid, which was a great event. It's \$1 billion investment in downtown San Francisco. I think the good thing the building we know and love remains the same. And the biggest changes to the ground floor in the park, in the lobby and just making it more open and transparent and welcoming. I think Norman Foster, who was the architect, said that was the one kind of flaw he saw in the building was just making it more open and active. So there's going to be art and cultural events in the park adjacent to it, and it's just much more open and inviting. So check it out. Thank you.

14. REVIEW OF PAST EVENTS AT THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS, BOARD OF APPEALS AND HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION

None.

E. GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT

SPEAKERS: Georgia Schuttish – Photos of 20 Raycliff Terrace shown during 9/12 General Public Comment illustrate why the Demo Calcs should be adjusted as argued in the email/pdf sent to Commission

and Staff on 9/11. This should have been reviewed as a Demolition both prior to and after the Enforcement. It should have had a CUA. It was A rated historic house. During Enforcement developers manipulated design putting Horizontal value at 50%. They redesigned project when caught. The Vertical is way over threshold. The Calcs should be adjusted as the Commission has the legislative authority to do under Section 317 (b) (2) (D). Year two values shown on the screen are the threshold that would preserve housing. If the house on Raycliff could be demolished using the loophole of the existing Demo Calcs, how can the sound housing in the Priority Equity neighborhoods be protected as promised in the Housing Element.

Francisco DaCosta – Climate change

Sue Hestor – Have a presentation on the effects of AB1114

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.

16. [2024-006735PPS](#)

1324-1326 POWELL STREET – southeast corner of Fisher Alley; Lot 014A in Assessor's Block 0160 (District 3) – **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 demolition of the existing structure and replacement with a six-story over basement, 20,045 square foot mixed-use building with 26 SRO dwelling units and 2,002 square feet of ground floor commercial space. A total of 1,300 square feet of open space will be provided at the roof alongside 11 private balconies. The project sponsor submitted a notice of intent to construct the project on July 19, 2024. After the hearing, 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: + Matt Soisson – Project sponsor presentation
- Speaker – Affordability
+ Mark Loper – Response to comments and questions

ACTION: Reviewed and Commented

15a. [2007.0946GPR-04](#)

(M. SNYDER: (628) 652-7460)

CANDLESTICK POINT DEVELOPMENT PROJECT – GENERAL PLAN CONSISTENCY FINDINGS ASSOCIATED WITH REDEVELOPMENT PLAN AMENDMENTS – The Candlestick Point development project consists of roughly 281 acres at Candlestick Point and generally encompasses the former Candlestick Park Stadium and parking lot, the Candlestick Point State Recreational Area, the Alice Griffith Housing development site, and Assessor's Blocks 4917, 4918, 4934, and 4935 – Request for Adoption of **Findings of Consistency** with the General Plan and the eight priority policies of Planning Code Section 101.1 for amendments to both the Bayview Hunters Point Redevelopment Plan and the Hunters Point Shipyard Redevelopment Plan. These amendments would: (1) allow the transfer of 2,050,000 square feet of office / research and development (R&D) entitlement from Hunters Point Shipyard (HPS) to Candlestick Point (CP); (2) allow visitor and entertainment uses throughout most of CP; (3) confirm certain commercial uses, such as "maker space", permitted at HPS, are also permitted at CP; (4) adjust Redevelopment Plan time limits; and (5) adjust certain Redevelopment Plan financing provisions and time limits. The amendments would enable the continued implementation of the Candlestick Point Development Project, including a re-envisioned Candlestick Center (one of four planned neighborhoods at Candlestick Point) as an "Innovation District" that would include approximately 2,800,000 square feet of office, R&D, and other similar and supporting uses. Candlestick Point is within the Candlestick Point Activity Node Special Use District, the CP Height and Bulk District, and within Zone 1 of Area B of the Bayview Hunters Point Redevelopment Project Area.

Preliminary Recommendation: Adopt Findings of Consistency

- SPEAKERS:
- = Rachael Tanner – Introduction
 - = Mat Snyder – Staff presentation
 - = Lila Hussain, OCII – Shipyard presentation
 - + Katrina Kidd – Project sponsor presentation
 - + Speaker – Design presentation
 - + La Shon Walker – Community outreach
 - Francisco Da Costa – Respect remains of the indigenous people, quality of life
 - + Brenda Cordova – We need affordable housing, project is taking too long
 - + Carmen Rodriguez – Affordable housing for low income and seniors
 - + Gabriela Moreno – Prioritize affordable housing
 - + Speaker – Homeownership
 - Joyce – Corruption, contamination
 - + Rudy Gonzales – Delays, create jobs
 - + Rev. Dr. Carolyn Scott – Go forward with the project
 - + Dan Torres – Opportunity, pathway for homeownership
 - + Mel Simmons – Project is very important for contractors
 - + Mauricio Chavez – Work opportunities
 - + Derek – Navy delays
 - + John Anthony – Affordable housing, work opportunities for carpenters
 - + Kimberley Hillebrand – Home
 - + Andrea Baker – Community engagement, created workshops
 - + Shaun – Job opportunities
 - + Trisha Gregory – Get the youth and community in the trades
 - + Kumar – Exciting and long awaited project, jobs, affordable new housing
 - + Jane Natoli – Benefits this project will bring
 - + Kevin Grey – Benefit everyone
 - + John – Community benefits agreement
 - + Brendan Green – Stimulate the local economy
 - + Alex Lansberg – Clean up in the shipyard, value of the project
 - + Corey Smith – Support getting housing built faster
 - + Linda Fadeke Richardson – Economic revitalization
 - + Arande Sterling – Bring economic development
 - + Cornelius Jordan – Advocate community engagement, development design
 - + Aster James – Business opportunities
 - + Dr. Veronica Honnicutt – Investments in Bayview
 - + Niola Gibbs – Job opportunities
 - + Joyce Armstrong - Support
 - + Roberta Achtenberg – Response to comments and questions
 - + Speaker – Response to comments and questions
 - + Matt Gray – Response to comments and questions
- ACTION: Adopted Findings
- AYES: Campbell, McGarry, So, Williams, Braun, Imperial, Moore
- NAYS: None
- MOTION: [21607](#)

15b. [2007.0946CWP-04](#) (M. SNYDER: (628) 652-7460)

CANDLESTICK POINT DESIGN-FOR-DEVELOPMENT AMENDMENTS – The Candlestick Point development project consists of roughly 281 acres at Candlestick Point and generally encompasses the former Candlestick Park Stadium and parking lot, the Candlestick Point State Recreational Area, the Alice Griffith Housing development site, and Assessor's Blocks 4917, 4918, 4934, and 4935 – Request to Approve **Amendments** to the Candlestick Point Design-for-Development (D4D). These amendments would provide a framework for the creation of an Innovation District by: (1) establishing requirements for a public realm network including the creation of a new Central Promenade; (2) increasing allowed heights from a maximum of 120 feet to a maximum of 180 feet; (3)

establishing active use requirements for fronting uses and portions of the public realm; (4) establishing modulation, articulation and similar requirements for buildings, among other provision. The amendments would enable the continued implementation of the Candlestick Point Development Project, including a re-envisioned Candlestick Center (one of four planned neighborhoods at Candlestick Point) as an "Innovation District" that would include approximately 2,800,000 square feet of office, R&D, and other similar and supporting uses. Candlestick Point is within the Candlestick Point Activity Node Special Use District, the CP Height and Bulk District, and within Zone 1 of Area B of the Bayview Hunters Point Redevelopment Project Area.
Preliminary Recommendation: Approve

SPEAKERS: Same as item 15a.
ACTION: Approved Amendments
AYES: Campbell, McGarry, So, Williams, Braun, Imperial, Moore
NAYS: None
MOTION: [21608](#)

ADJOURNMENT 4:15 PM

ADOPTED SEPTEMBER 26, 2024