

# SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING COMMISSION

## Meeting Minutes

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

Thursday, March 2, 2023

1:00 p.m.

## Regular Meeting

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Tanner, Moore, Braun, Diamond, Imperial, Koppel  
COMMISSIONERS ABSENT: Ruiz

THE MEETING WAS CALLED TO ORDER BY PRESIDENT TANNER AT 1:06 PM

STAFF IN ATTENDANCE: Aaron Starr, AnMarie Rodgers, Danielle Ngo, Amnon Ben-Pazi, Alex Westhoff, Ella Samonsky, Ryan Balba, David Winslow, Liz 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 OF ITEMS PROPOSED FOR CONTINUANCE

The Commission will consider a request for continuance to a later date. The Commission may choose to continue the item to the date proposed below, to continue the item to another date, or to hear the item on this calendar.

1. 2022-004869CUA (H. SAMUELS: (628) 652-7545)  
3352 STEINER STREET –east side between Chestnut and Lombard Streets; Lot 022 in Assessor's Block 0491 (District 2) – Request for **Conditional Use Authorization** pursuant to Planning Code Section 202.2, 303, 303.1, and 711 to establish an approximately 2,300

square-foot formula retail use (d.b.a Bluestone Lane) within the vacant commercial ground floor of an existing three-story mixed-use building within a NC-2 (Small Scale Neighborhood Commercial) Zoning District and 40-X Height and Bulk District. There will be no expansion of the 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).

**(Proposed for Continuance to March 16, 2023)**

SPEAKERS: Patricia Boyd – Requesting PS to contact them  
ACTION: Continued to March 16, 2023  
AYES: Braun, Diamond, Imperial, Koppel, Moore, Tanner  
ABSENT: Ruiz

- 2a. 2019-022404ENX (E. SAMONSKY: (628) 652-7417)  
1458 SAN BRUNO AVENUE – west side at terminus of San Bruno Avenue; Lots 015 and 006A in Assessor's Block 4277 (District 9) – Request for **Large Project Authorization** pursuant to Planning Code Sections 329, and 841 to demolish three light industrial buildings that contained an unauthorized dwelling unit and new construction of more than 25,000 gross square feet for a seven-story residential building, with a maximum height of approximately 73-feet, containing in total 225 dwelling units (9 three-bedroom, 81 two-bedroom, 1 one-bedroom, and 133 studios), 56 vehicle parking space, 2 car share spaces, and 134 Class One bicycle parking spaces, under the Individually Requested State Density Bonus Program pursuant to Planning Code Section 206.6 and California Government Code Section 65915. The project seeks waivers from development standards, including Rear Yard (Section 134), Dwelling Unit Exposure (Section 140), Off-Street Loading (section 151.1), and Height Limit (Section 260) requirements of the Planning Code, pursuant to State Density Bonus Law. The Project is located in a MUR (Mixed-Use Residential) Zoning District and 40-X Height and Bulk District. The Planning Department issued a Community Plan Evaluation pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The Commission's action constitutes the Approval Action for the project for the purposes of CEQA, pursuant to San Francisco Administrative Code Section [31.04](#)(h).  
*Preliminary Recommendation: Approve with Conditions*  
(Continued from a Regular hearing on January 19, 2022)  
**(Proposed for Indefinite Continuance)**

SPEAKERS: None  
ACTION: Continued Indefinitely  
AYES: Braun, Diamond, Imperial, Koppel, Moore, Tanner  
ABSENT: Ruiz

- 2b. 2019-022404CUA (E. SAMONSKY: (628) 652-7417)  
1458 SAN BRUNO AVENUE – west side at terminus of San Bruno Avenue; Lots 015 and 006A in Assessor's Block 4277 (District 9) – Request for **Conditional Use Authorization** pursuant to Planning Code Sections 303, 317 and 841 to demolish three light industrial buildings that contained an unauthorized dwelling unit and construct a seven-story residential building, with a maximum height of approximately 73-feet, containing in total 225 dwelling units (9 three-bedroom, 81 two-bedroom, 1 one-bedroom, and 133 studios),

56 vehicle parking space, 2 car share spaces, and 134 Class One bicycle parking spaces, in a MUR (Mixed-Use Residential) Zoning District and 40-X Height and Bulk District.

*Preliminary Recommendation: Approve with Conditions*

(Continued from a Regular hearing on January 19, 2022)

**(Proposed for Indefinite Continuance)**

SPEAKERS: Same as item 2a.

ACTION: Continued Indefinitely

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

ABSENT: Ruiz

- 2c. 2019-022404SHD (E. SAMONSKY: (628) 652-7417)  
1458 SAN BRUNO AVENUE – west side at terminus of San Bruno Avenue; Lots 015 and 006A in Assessor's Block 4277 (District 9) – Request for adoption of **Shadow Findings** pursuant to Planning Code Section 295 that net new shadow from the project would not adversely affect the use of Potrero Del Sol Park and James Rolph Jr. Playground under the jurisdiction of the Recreation and Park Commission, in a MUR (Mixed-Use Residential) Zoning District and 40-X Height and Bulk District.  
*Preliminary Recommendation: Approve*  
(Continued from a Regular hearing on January 19, 2022)  
**(Proposed for Indefinite Continuance)**

SPEAKERS: Same as item 2a.

ACTION: Continued Indefinitely

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

ABSENT: Ruiz

## B. CONSENT CALENDAR

All matters listed hereunder constitute a Consent Calendar, are considered to be routine by the Planning Commission, and may be acted upon by a single roll call vote of the Commission. There will be no separate discussion of these items unless a member of the Commission, the public, or staff so requests, in which event the matter shall be removed from the Consent Calendar and considered as a separate item at this or a future hearing.

3. [2022-011855CUA](#) (D. SPYCHER: (628) 652-7588)  
667 COMMERCIAL STREET – south side between Kearny and Montgomery Streets; Lot 026 in Assessor's Block 0227 (District 3) – Request for **Conditional Use Authorization** pursuant to Planning Code Section 303 and 810 to change use from Limited Restaurant to establish a Restaurant Use (d.b.a. Sisterita) on the first floor of the subject property within the CCB (Chinatown-Community Business) Zoning District and 50-N 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: Braun, Diamond, Imperial, Koppel, Moore, Tanner  
ABSENT: Ruiz  
MOTION: [21259](#)

5. [2017-003559CUA-02](#) (R. BALBA: (628) 652-7331)  
3700 CALIFORNIA STREET – area generally bounded by California Street to the south, Sacramento Street to the north, Cherry Street to the west, and Maple Street to the east; Lots 001, 052 & 053 in Assessor's Block 1015, Lots 001-009 in Assessor's Block 1016, and Lots 027 & 028 in Assessor's Block 1017 (District 2) – Request for modification to the **Conditions Of Approval** pertaining to project Validity, Expiration, and Renewal for the project's Conditional Use and Planned Unit Development Authorization authorized under Motion No. 20672 by extending their validity by three years. Under the requested modification, the authorizations would be valid until February 27, 2026. No changes are proposed to the previously approved project.  
*Preliminary Recommendation: Approve with Conditions*

SPEAKERS: None  
ACTION: Approved with Conditions  
AYES: Braun, Diamond, Imperial, Koppel, Moore, Tanner  
ABSENT: Ruiz  
MOTION: [21260](#)

6. [2022-003511CUA](#) (B. GUNN: (628) 652-7367)  
268 CHURCH STREET –northwest corner of 15<sup>th</sup> Street; Lot 005 in Assessor's Block 3543 (District 8) – Request for **Conditional Use Authorization** pursuant to Planning Code Sections 202.2, 303, and 764 to establish an approximately 933 square-foot Cannabis Retail Use (d.b.a. "Positive Green, LLC") within an existing vacant commercial space with no on-site smoking or vaporizing of cannabis products within the Upper Market NCD (Neighborhood Commercial District) and 40-X Height and Bulk District. The Planning Department found that the project is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The Commission's action constitutes the Approval Action for the project for the purposes of CEQA, pursuant to San Francisco Administrative Code section [31.04](#)(h).  
*Preliminary Recommendation: Approve with Conditions*

SPEAKERS: None  
ACTION: Approved with Conditions  
AYES: Braun, Diamond, Imperial, Koppel, Moore, Tanner  
ABSENT: Ruiz  
MOTION: [21261](#)

- 7a. [2016-007303DNX-02](#) (R. SALGADO: (628) 652-7332)  
5 THIRD STREET – southeast corner of Market Street; Lot 057 in Assessor's Block 3707 (District 6) – Request to modify conditions of approval for an existing **Downtown Project Authorization** approved by the Planning Commission on April 25, 2019, under Motion No. 20436 to extend the project's authorization and validity by three years to April 24, 2026. The Project authorized under Motion No. 20436 includes the rehabilitation of the existing 13-story, 161,108-square-foot building and conversion of approximately 119,237 square feet of office use to a 170-room hotel on the second through twelfth floors of the Project Site, with approximately 5,920 square feet of office use to remain on the second and third

floors and with approximately 11,393 square feet of retail space to remain on the basement and ground floors. The Project has not changed since it was approved on April 25, 2019. The Project is located within a C-3-O (Downtown-Office) Zoning District and the 120-X Height and Bulk District.

*Preliminary Recommendation: Approve with Conditions*

SPEAKERS: None  
ACTION: Approved with Conditions  
AYES: Braun, Diamond, Imperial, Koppel, Moore, Tanner  
ABSENT: Ruiz  
MOTION: [21262](#)

- 7b. [2016-007303CUA-02](#) (R. SALGADO: (628) 652-7332)  
5 THIRD STREET – southeast corner of Market Street; Lot 057 in Assessor's Block 3707 (District 6) – Request to modify conditions of approval for an existing **Conditional Use Authorization** approved by the Planning Commission on April 25, 2019, under Motion No. 20437 to extend the project's authorization and validity by three years to April 24, 2026. The Project authorized under Motion No. 20437 includes the rehabilitation of the existing 13-story, 161,108-square-foot building and conversion of approximately 119,237 square feet of office use to a 170-room hotel on the second through twelfth floors of the Project Site, with approximately 5,920 square feet of office use to remain on the second and third floors and with approximately 11,393 square feet of retail space to remain on the basement and ground floors. The Project has not changed since it was approved on April 25, 2019. The Project is located within a C-3-O (Downtown-Office) Zoning District and the 120-X Height and Bulk District.

*Preliminary Recommendation: Approve with Conditions*

SPEAKERS: Same as item 7a.  
ACTION: Approved with Conditions  
AYES: Braun, Diamond, Imperial, Koppel, Moore, Tanner  
ABSENT: Ruiz  
MOTION: [21263](#)

## C. COMMISSION MATTERS

### 8. Land Acknowledgement

#### **President Tanner:**

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.

9. Consideration of Adoption:
- [Draft Minutes for February 16, 2023 – Closed Session](#)
  - [Draft Minutes for February 16, 2023 – Regular](#)

SPEAKERS: None  
ACTION: Adopted  
AYES: Braun, Diamond, Imperial, Koppel, Moore, Tanner  
ABSENT: Ruiz

10. Commission Comments/Questions

**President Tanner:**

Well happy Women's History month everyone. It is already March if you can believe that. We just also ended Black History month and on Tuesday I was lucky enough and privileged to be able to interview Mayor Willie Brown. So, with all the Planning staff present talking about his tenure in San Francisco and some of the changes that he oversaw and definitely getting some wisdom and advice. So, it was really quite a treat and great to see all the staff there. I think there is a recording, an audio recording that is out there. So, the video is not very exciting. I think it's the side of my head for most of it, but the audio is good. Maybe just treat it like a podcast than a video recording. So, that was very exciting and I want to thank Director Hillis, who will join us later, for helping to arrange that. And certainly something that I think all of us who were present were really excited to be able to be there. I did want to ask Ms. Watty, maybe you can pass this on to Director Hillis, to see when we can schedule the update on Housing Element implementation. I know there is a lot going on and I've gotten some questions from members of the public just wondering about certain parts of the Housing For All plan and like how that is unfolding. And I'm also curious as well, and so I think it could bode a good discussion here along with something that Vice President Moore had asked about which is a new legislation in California that is in place this year related to Housing and Planning and Land Use so that we can kind of get a sense of just other things we might be expecting. So, I'm not sure if that is already scheduled or what you all are thinking about.

**Liz Watty, Director of Current Planning:**

Sure. And I believe AnMarie Rodgers is here and she, I believe, is taking the lead on scheduling the hearing so she may have a date already available. But if not, we are close to scheduling one? Maybe that's it. We're really close to scheduling one. It will certainly be early spring. It's coming up soon and we are all working on it.

**President Tanner:**

Okay, great. And I'm going to send some of the questions I have gotten. Then can maybe even just be answered in Director's Comments just really quickly in addition to a longer discussion. The only other item I wanted to bring up Commissioners, is some discussion around design review. This comes from our hearing a few back, just thinking about a lot of times we stick to our 5 minutes, at least I stick to our 5 minutes for sponsor presentations. I think for the most part it works fairly well and then we ask follow-up questions. But if you do see a project coming up that you think the architecture deserves additional time, please let me know in advance and we can make sure the sponsor knows, "Hey, you'll have a few more minutes. Please take you know maybe seven minutes to include design discussions"; and or, if you forget, and you just realize when the project is here like, "Oh I want to learn

more", we can certainly ask for additional time during the hearing even before public comment, so if you want to have it be contiguous with the discussion of the project. Just to be able to dive a little deeper into design as well as the community outreach and other things that sometimes take up more of the sponsor's energy. So, just a note there and open to other ideas that folks may have about how we can make sure that we certainly hear about the design as well as the other elements that are important to the project.

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

Commissioner Tanner, just for your and the public's interest, the Housing Element implementation informational update is currently scheduled for April 27<sup>th</sup>.

**President Tanner:**

April 27<sup>th</sup>. Okay, I will probably send some of the questions so we can have them answered in the interim and then we'll look forward to that hearing.

**Commissioner Moore:**

Just briefly, without having a discussion, adding a couple thoughts for design review. In the past it was recommended by this Commission and former Commissions to give large project applicants an independent element in, during any meeting, to present the design even when it is in the process of still being developed so that we familiarize ourselves with the challenges and with the opportunities these larger designs allow. For example, if 3700 California is coming back, which was a very extensively reviewed project, very detailed in its design, I think the Commission except for Commissioner Koppel and myself who were there, would greatly benefit together with a public to refresh themselves on what the issues were, what the challenges were and how we best address them. That would be one example. But there are many other large projects and I think it's in the benefit of the public as well as ourselves to help listen, comment early, on rather than just commenting when it is almost too late. We really are creating hindrances and delays rather than constructively and creatively participating. That would be my recommendation.

**President Tanner:**

Great, thank you for the suggestion.

**Commissioner Diamond:**

I want to endorse both of what Commissioners Tanner and Moore said. I was actually here for the 3700 project as well too which was one of the first items I heard as a Commissioner. But I have noticed recently that we are- that the project sponsors are spending almost all of their 5 minutes on their relations with and their interaction with and the response to the neighborhood groups and the context. All of which are critical and important but it gives the appearance that we are also not that interested in design, that that is secondary. And yes, I do think, of course we have the opportunity to ask them questions, but some of them spent years and millions of dollars to get to the point where they have a design and I want to make sure that our 5-minute limit does not change the way in which they come prepared to make the presentation, because I'd like a full on architectural presentation. A good example was the incredible Native American Cultural Center that we heard a few weeks ago where there, it is a really creative and unusual design and almost none of the presentation was on that and it was all around the need for the project. So, I am concerned that our 5-minute rule shifts the focus almost entirely to one very important subject, but at the expense of another very important subject. And as we go forward with some of these

projects that we're going to see in front of us going forward, especially in light of the Housing Element, that the design of these housing projects is really important. And so, I agree with both of you, that one way there are several ways to handle that. I think a critical way is to have an information session early on. I believe that what we did with Stonestown is too late in the process. It feels like they are so far along that when they heard our comments, they feel like they have done the deal already and that we are slowing them down, and that is a very awkward position I think for us to be in as Commissioners, that we need to be able to provide our input early enough that they can seriously give it attention. And the same with 3700. So, I am just wondering whether or not for projects of a certain scale we should be very clear in our instructions, and staff should be clear in their instructions to project presenters, that we want to hear about the negotiations and the discussions with the neighbors and we really want a presentation on design. And if they feel they need 5 minutes, then they should let us know ahead of time so that we can grant it because it seems like sometimes people show up and they are about to do a 10-minute presentation and we say you've got 5 and they are like, "Hey, I thought I had 10" and Mr. Ionin says, "No, you've got 5 but you can respond to questions". So, I think they might be getting mixed messages and we should just be really clear. But I absolutely believe that these larger projects, that the design should very much be part of their primary presentation.

**President Tanner:**

Yeah, thank you. Maybe it is something we can add to our Officers meetings as we're discussing projects and staff just being on notice to also bring to our attention, "Hey, this is something that we may want to spend more time on or have an informational session on". So, we can join forces and kind of seeking out when we need to use that discretion. Thank you all for your comments on that.

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

I think the CPC Officers meeting is the appropriate venue to vet that. If there are no further Commissioner comments, Commissioners, if I may, we had a meeting with the City Administrator's Office for additional guidance on remote public participation. So, I guess last week or even the week prior, you have indicated to me that we will certainly continue the practice of remote public comment. The City Administrator's Office provided us with additional guidance that if we are to continue with remote public comment that we establish a time limit associated with it. But that time limit should be consistent throughout the entire agenda. They used an example of 20 minutes. I think that is extremely short. Even if we were to go for an hour that would be 20 people maximum. And their recommendation is that if we were to establish a time limit that we actually adhere to it and cut people off who may already be in the queue who haven't had an opportunity to speak. This would not apply to quasi-judicial items such as negative declarations that come before you, and so the board of appeals which is a quasi-judicial body has already adopted the policy that they are simply not going to establish time limits because most the items they consider there are appeals, if not all. So, I brought this to the Historic Preservation Commission yesterday. We've had no issues at the Historic Preservation Commission nor do I feel we would have any issues here with remote public comment. They've decided to not set any time limits. So, I will seek your direction today if you would like to impose any consistent time limit. Now this could change from agenda to agenda, but on each agenda the time will have to be consistent for every item.



**Commissioner Moore:**

Could we think about it a little bit more before just jumping in and having opinion? The other question I would like to ask you being the leader of the technology here, with the new latest setup from a few weeks ago, the pause with you calling on somebody and those people responding, that is an awfully long theatrical pause and I am wondering if that pause could be shortened.

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

Well, we've successfully gotten away with that today for the first time.

**Commissioner Moore:**

Okay.

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

Thanks to the Department of Technology, media services and SFGovTV working collaboratively, we have gotten rid of \*6 to unmute themselves. So, today we shouldn't have that long pause because they need to hear that you are being requested to be unmuted, they need to press \*6, and then they need to hear that you have been unmuted. So, all of that is gone and we're back to the old way we have been unmuting people and so it is simply they are being unmuted and they hear a prompt, you have been unmuted, and so that is their indication to begin speaking. So, it should be much smoother now moving forward.

**Commissioner Moore:**

Perhaps we could observe today and see if there is an in between pattern without really nailing it today. That would be my preference.

**President Tanner:**

Yeah, I would agree. I don't know that I, it's been fairly smooth. So, it doesn't seem, I wouldn't have a time limit today that I would propose but certainly good to know the option and be able to think about it for a little bit.

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

Yeah, and the City Administrator's Office will be reviewing this practice moving forward. They were asking us to adopt time frames so that there is a consistency across all policy bodies but we are far ahead of the game. Many policy bodies have not been conducting hybrid hearings. Many policy bodies don't have staff behind the scenes helping them the way I do. So, I think it is a very different situation than most, but yeah, so for now I will keep status quo. If there is any desire in the future, please let me know and we can agendize that then [inaudible]

**President Tanner:**

Yeah. And we may get busier agendas and that is where it becomes more needed that we just have more items. So, we look forward to that day.

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

Yup. Very good Commissioners. Thank you for that.

**D. DEPARTMENT MATTERS****11. Director's Announcements**

None.

**12. Review of Past Events at the Board of Supervisors, Board of Appeals and Historic Preservation Commission****Aaron Starr, Manager of Legislative Affairs:**

Good afternoon, Commissioner's, Aaron Starr Manager of Legislative Affairs.

**Land Use**

**220340** Planning Code - Neighborhood Commercial and Mixed-Use Zoning Districts. Sponsor: Dorsey. Staff: Starr.

The week, the Committee considered Sup. Dorsey Article 8 Reorg which also includes other substantive amendments. Supervisor Dorsey made some additional minor amendments, none of them were deemed substantive; however, Supervisor Peskin asked the item be continued for two weeks. He would like this ordinance, which has a minor upzoning in it by allowing 100% affordable group housing the SALI district, to be paired with another ordinance that would prohibit Home SF in Article 10 Districts.

**220878** Planning, Building Codes - Penalties for Code Enforcement. Sponsors: Ronen; Peskin and Chan. Staff: Merlone.

Also on the docket and continued, was Supervisor Ronen's ordinance that would amend Penalties for Code Enforcement in the Planning Code. Proposed amendments were not yet drafted and signed to form, so the sponsor requested an extra week.

**221261** Planning Code, Zoning Map - The Village Special Use District. Sponsor: Mayor. Staff: Westhoff.

One item did make it out of committee, that was the Village SUD. This item would create an SUD to facilitate the development of "The Village", a mixed-use facility specifically serving San Francisco's Native American population. The 6-story, 41,000 sq. ft. building will include a youth recreation and development center, an elder services center and community gathering, youth programs and other social services, a dental clinic, a medical clinic and group housing rooms.

Commissioners you heard this on January 26, and recommended approval for both the SUD and the CUA. The Conditional Use approval is contingent upon the SUD becoming effective.

During the hearing, Planning presented the item on behalf of the mayor's office. There were two speakers from the project team, and about a dozen or more public commentators, all in favor. Once public comment was done all supervisors on the committee praised the project and asked to be added as cosponsors. The item was then sent to the Full Board with a positive recommendation.

**Full Board**

No Planning Department Items

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

Aaron, did you mention Victoria Gray's consideration at the Rules Committee?

**Aaron Starr, Manager of Legislative Affairs:**

No.

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

So, Victoria Gray was nominated to replace Commissioner Johns for the Historic Preservation Commission and was moved forward to full board with a 2-1 vote. Commissioners, if there are no questions related to the Board of Supervisors report, there is no report from the Board of Appeals. The Historic Preservation Commission did meet yesterday and they adopted a Historic Context Statement related to the San Francisco New Deal Historic Context Statement Rebuilding The City from 1933 - 1943. A really wonderful report. I can strongly recommend the read. In fact, it was suggested it be published into a book. Also, the Historic Preservation Commission initiated landmark designation for the property at 2041 Larkin Street, The Church for the Fellowship of All Peoples, established by Dr. Alfred Fisk and Dr. Howard Thurman.

**E. GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT**

**SPEAKERS:** Georgia Schuttish - CUA hearing legalizing Cumberland TTD raised questions needing answers. Why was project reviewed as alteration when three thresholds were exceeded in 2017 Demo Calc Matrix and fourth was close? Why did 2019 Cumberland plans also use Article 10 thresholds, when house had been down-graded to "C"? Why did 20 Raycliff Terrace, designed in Second Bay Tradition, A-rated contributor not have Calcs measured against the Article 10 thresholds? Why was design revision for Raycliff alteration allowed during 2020 Enforcement Action to be just up to, but not over 317 thresholds, thereby avoiding the CUA? Why have there been so many Alterations, primarily speculative projects, often selling the Entitlements, having issues with the Demo Calcs, accepted and approved by Staff contrary to the intent of Planning Code Section 317 as stated in the Findings at Section 317 (a)? And why have the Calcs never been adjusted per Section 317 (b) (2) (D)?  
Anastasia Yovanopoulos – Remote call-in for public comments  
Patricia Boyd – Master plan for Lombard

**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.

13. [2018-017026GPA](#) (D. NGO: (628) 652-7591)  
SAN FRANCISCO ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE FRAMEWORK & GENERAL PLAN INTRODUCTION  
 – Consideration of **Approval of Amendments** to the San Francisco General Plan – Pursuant to San Francisco Charter Section 4.105, Planning Code Section 340(d) and Section 306.3, the Planning Commission will consider a resolution adopting amendments to the Introduction to the General Plan, incorporating the San Francisco Environmental Justice Framework into the General Plan by reference, making Planning Code Section 101.1 findings, and recommending that the Board of Supervisors adopt an Ordinance approving the amendments. On January 26, 2023, the Planning Commission passed Resolution No. 21238 to initiate amendments to the General Plan. If the Planning Commission adopts the amendments, the Commission will forward the proposal to the Board of Supervisors for consideration of adoption.  
*Preliminary Recommendation: Approve*
- SPEAKERS: = AnMarie Rodgers – Staff presentation  
 = Danielle Ngo – Staff presentation  
 = Amnon Ben-Pazi – Staff presentation  
 + Antonio Diaz – Participated in the working group
- ACTION: Approved Amendments and adopted Environmental Justice Framework with additions submitted by Staff
- AYES: Braun, Diamond, Imperial, Koppel, Moore, Tanner
- ABSENT: Ruiz
- RESOLUTION: [21264](#)
14. [2021-005938CUA](#) (A. WESTHOFF: (628) 652-7314)  
276 GRAND VIEW AVENUE – west side between 22<sup>nd</sup> and Alvarado Streets; Lot 012 in Assessor's Block 2764 (District 8) – Request for **Conditional Use Authorization** pursuant to Planning Code Sections 303 and 317, to demolish an existing two-story-over-garage single-family residence and construct a new three-story-over-garage building containing two-dwelling units within a RH-2 (Residential-House, Two Family) Zoning District, Central Neighborhoods Large Residence SUD (Special Use District), and 40-X Height and Bulk District. The Planning Department found that the project is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The Commission's action constitutes the Approval Action for the project for the purposes of CEQA, pursuant to San Francisco Administrative Code section [31.04](#)(h).  
*Preliminary Recommendation: Approve with Conditions*  
 (Continued from Regular hearing on February 16, 2023)
- SPEAKERS: = Alex Westhoff – Staff report  
 + Juancho Isidoro – Project sponsor presentation  
 = Georgia Schuttish – Could it have been preserved vs demo
- ACTION: Approved with Conditions
- AYES: Braun, Diamond, Imperial, Koppel, Moore, Tanner
- ABSENT: Ruiz
- MOTION: [21265](#)
15. [2020-010275ENX](#) (E. SAMONSKY: (628) 652-7417)  
98 PENNSYLVANIA STREET – northwest corner of 17<sup>th</sup> Street; Lot 002 in Assessor's Block 3948 (District 10) – Request for **Large Project Authorization** pursuant to Planning Code

Sections 329 and Adoption of Findings Related to State Density Bonus pursuant to Planning Code Section 206.6 and California Government Code Section 65915 to demolish a surface parking lot and construct a six-story, 60 foot-tall, residential building containing 64 dwelling units (five three-bedroom, 28 two-bedroom, 20 one-bedroom, and 11 studios), 23 vehicle parking spaces and 64 Class One bicycle parking spaces within a UMU (Urban Mixed-Use) Zoning District and 48-X Height and Bulk District. The project seeks waivers from development standards, including Rear Yard (Section 134), Ground Floor Ceiling Height (Section 145.1), and Height Limit (Section 250) requirements of the Planning Code pursuant to State Density Bonus Law. The Planning Department issued a community plan evaluation pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The Commission's action constitutes the Approval Action for the project for the purposes of CEQA, pursuant to San Francisco Administrative Code Section [31.04\(h\)](#).

*Preliminary Recommendation: Approve with Conditions*

(Continued from Regular hearing on February 9, 2023)

SPEAKERS: = Ella Samonsky – Staff report  
 + John Kevlin – Ready to have the hearing today  
 - Alison Heath – How can project be built, plans inaccurate, code issue and public safety issue, request continuance  
 - Steven - No labor standards, request continuance  
 - Sue Hestor – Requesting continuance, inadequate information  
 = Kristen Jensen, Deputy CA - Response to comments and questions  
 = Rich Hillis – Response to comments and questions

ACTION: Approved with Conditions

AYES: Braun, Diamond, Imperial, Koppel, Tanner

NAYS : Moore

ABSENT: Ruiz

MOTION: [21266](#)

4. [2022-012037CUA](#) (R. BALBA: (628) 652-7331)  
2050 CHESTNUT STREET – north side between Pierce Street and Mallorca Way; Lot 008 in Assessor's Block 0486A (District 2) – Request for **Conditional Use Authorization** pursuant to Planning Code Sections 303, and 303.1, and 711, to establish a formula retail use (d.b.a Mejuri) within the ground floor of an existing four-story mixed-use building, within a NC-2 (Small Scale Neighborhood Commercial) Zoning District and 40-X 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: = Ryan Balba – Staff report  
 = Patricia Boyd – Request to be removed from Consent, concerns with the drawings and specifics on the window glazing

ACTION: Approved with Conditions

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

ABSENT: Ruiz

MOTION: [21267](#)

## G. DISCRETIONARY REVIEW CALENDAR

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

16. [2022-005429DRP](#) (D. WINSLOW: (628) 652-7335)  
681 12<sup>TH</sup> AVENUE – west side between Cabrillo and Balboa Streets; Lot 009E in Assessor's Block 1632 (District 1) – Request for **Discretionary Review** of Building Permit No. 2022.0211.7855 to construct a new 285 square foot accessory structure at the rear of an existing single-family dwelling within a RH-1 (Residential House-One 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*

SPEAKERS: = David Winslow – Staff report  
 - Pamela Fine – DR presentation  
 + Brent Martin – Project sponsor presentation  
 + Barry Lee – Issues with DR requestor and support project.  
 + Jenny Chin – Project sponsor rebuttal  
 ACTION: No DR  
 AYES: Braun, Diamond, Imperial, Koppel, Moore, Tanner  
 ABSENT: Ruiz  
 DRA: [814](#)

17. [2021-001801DRP-02](#) (D. WINSLOW: (628) 652-7335)  
1027 - 1029 CLAYTON STREET – west side between 17<sup>th</sup> Street and Parnassus Avenue; Lot 021 in Assessor's Block 1279 (District 8) – Request for **Discretionary Review** of Building Permit No. 2020.1221.1394 for the construction of new three-story over basement, two-family dwelling 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 15, 2022)

SPEAKERS: = David Winslow – Staff report  
 + Steve Barrabee – Withdrew DR  
 - Dave Ryan – DR presentation  
 + Jeremy Schaub – Project sponsor presentation  
 + Speaker – Need more housing  
 ACTION: Took DR and Approved with modification, reducing the proposed deck on the west side by two-feet.

AYES: Braun, Diamond, Imperial, Koppel, Moore, Tanner  
ABSENT: Ruiz  
DRA: [815](#)

ADJOURNMENT 4:10 PM  
ADOPTED MARCH 16, 2023