

# SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING COMMISSION

## Meeting Minutes

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

**Thursday, April 4, 2024**  
**12:00 p.m.**  
**Regular Meeting**

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: DIAMOND, MOORE, BRAUN, IMPERIAL, KOPPEL, WILLIAMS  
COMMISSIONERS ABSENT: NONE

THE MEETING WAS CALLED TO ORDER BY PRESIDENT DIAMOND AT 12:02 PM

STAFF IN ATTENDANCE: Aaron Starr, Jessica Look, Kalyani Agnihotri, Elizabeth Purl, Charles Enchill, David Winslow, Corey Teague – Zoning Administrator, Elizabeth Watty – Director of Current Planning, Rich Hillis – Planning Director, Jonas P. Ionin – Commission Secretary

### SPEAKER KEY:

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

### A. CONSIDERATION ITEMS PROPOSED FOR CONTINUANCE

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

- 1a. 2022-009794DRP (D. WINSLOW: (628) 652-7335)  
1153 GUERRERO STREET – southeast corner of Elizabeth Street; Lot 021 in Assessor's Block 3645 (District 9) – Request for **Discretionary Review** of Building Permit No. 2022.0513.4235 to replace the rear porch and enclosed stair within the existing footprint to a two-unit building within a RH-3 (Residential House – Three Family) Zoning District and 40-X Height and Bulk District. The existing building has full lot coverage, and the project would reconstruct the rear porch within the same footprint, which is located within the required rear yard. 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 February 29, 2024)

**Note: On December 14, 2023, after hearing and closing Public Comment, continued to January 25, 2024 with direction for staff to confirm accuracy of plans by a vote of +6 -0 (Ruiz absent). On January 25, 2024, without hearing, continued to February 29, 2024 by a vote of +5 -0 (Diamond absent). On February 29, 2024, without hearing, continued to April 4, 2024 by a vote of +6 -0.**

**(Proposed for Continuance to May 2, 2024)**

SPEAKERS: None  
 ACTION: Continued to May 2, 2024  
 AYES: Williams, Braun, Imperial, Koppel, Moore, Diamond  
 ABSENT: None

1b. 2022-009794VAR (L. AJELLO: (628) 652-7353)

1153 GUERRERO STREET – southeast corner of Elizabeth Street; Lot 021 in Assessor's Block 3645 (District 9) – Request for **Variance** from rear yard requirements of Planning Code Section 134 for a project that would replace an existing rear porch and enclosed stair within the existing footprint to a two-unit building within a RH-3 (Residential House – Three Family) Zoning District and 40-X Height and Bulk District. The Planning Code requires the subject property to maintain a rear yard of 32 feet (45% of lot depth). The existing building has full lot coverage, and the project would reconstruct the rear porch within the same footprint, which is located within the required rear yard.

(Continued from Regular hearing on February 29, 2024)

**(Proposed for Continuance to May 2, 2024)**

SPEAKERS: None  
 ACTION: ZA Continued to May 2, 2024

2. 2023-007496DRP (D. WINSLOW: (628) 652-7335)

638 RHODE ISLAND STREET – west side between 18th and 19th Streets; Lot 005 in Assessor's Block 4030 (District 10) – Request for **Discretionary Review** of Building Permit Nos. 2023.0613.9926 and 2023.0203.1391 to raise the roof of the two-story, single-family building at the rear of the property. Additionally, the proposal is to demolish and replace the existing stairs at the rear of the front 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 March 7, 2024)

**(Proposed for Continuance to May 9, 2024)**

SPEAKERS: None  
 ACTION: Continued to May 9, 2024  
 AYES: Williams, Braun, Imperial, Koppel, Moore, Diamond  
 ABSENT: None

3. 2022-006831DRM (D. WINSLOW: (628) 652-7335)

619 MARINA BOULEVARD – south side between Divisadero and Broderick Streets; Lot 026 in Assessor's Block 0911 (District 2) – Staff Initiated **Discretionary Review** of Building Permit Application No. 2022.0615.6422; Planning Enforcement Case No. 2021-009773ENF proposing legalization of window openings altered without permit at the front façade within a RH-1 (Residential House, One-Family) 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 Conditions*

(Continued from Regular hearing on January 25, 2024)

**WITHDRAWN**

SPEAKERS: None  
ACTION: Withdrawn

## 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. [2023-001109CUA](#) (J. SACCHI: (628) 652-7308)  
[254 JULES AVENUE](#) – east side between De Montfort and Holloway Avenues; Lot 036 of Assessor's Block 6939 (District 11) – Request for **Conditional Use Authorization**, pursuant to Planning Code Section 209.1, 249.3, and 303 to permit the development of habitable space, including two bedrooms, at the ground floor of an existing single family home, resulting in a dwelling unit with five or more bedrooms within a RH-1 (Residential- House, One Family) Zoning District, Oceanview 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*

SPEAKERS: None  
ACTION: Approved with Conditions  
AYES: Williams, Braun, Imperial, Koppel, Moore, Diamond  
ABSENT: None  
MOTION: [21538](#)

5. [2023-011365CUA](#) (E. MAU: (628) 652-7583)  
[680 FOLSOM STREET](#) – west side between Hawthorne and 3rd Streets; Lots 013 and 014 in Assessor's Block 3735 (District 6) – Request for **Conditional Use Authorization** pursuant to Planning Code Section 210.2 to convert approximately 2,000 square feet of existing Retail Sales and Service space to Office Use (Non-Retail Sales and Service Use) on the ground floor within a C-3-S (Downtown Support) and C-3-O(SD) (Downtown-Office (Special Development)) Zoning Districts and 320-I 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: Williams, Braun, Imperial, Koppel, Moore, Diamond  
ABSENT: None  
MOTION: [21539](#)

6. [2022-008992CUA](#) (E. MAU: (628) 652-7583)  
[410 JESSIE STREET, UNIT 402](#) – north side between 5<sup>th</sup> and 6<sup>th</sup> Streets; Lot 137 in Assessor's Block 3704 (District 6) – Request for **Conditional Use Authorization** pursuant to Planning Code Sections 202.10, 209.1, and 303 to the subject property as an Intermediate Length Occupancy (ILO) unit. Classification as an ILO unit allows a dwelling

unit to be offered for occupancy for an initial stay with a duration of greater than 30 days but less than one year (365 days). ILO units are a use characteristic. The unit proposed for ILO classification will remain a dwelling unit. The subject property is located within a C-3-G (Downtown-General) Zoning District, a Priority Equity Geographies Special Use District, and a 90-X Height & Bulk District.

*Preliminary Recommendation: Approve with Conditions*

SPEAKERS: None  
ACTION: Approved with Conditions  
AYES: Williams, Braun, Imperial, Koppel, Moore, Diamond  
ABSENT: None  
MOTION: [21540](#)

## C. COMMISSION MATTERS

### 7. LAND ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

#### **Commissioner Williams:**

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.

### 8. CONSIDERATION OF ADOPTION:

- [Draft Minutes for March 21, 2024](#)

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

### 9. COMMISSION COMMENTS/QUESTIONS

#### **President Diamond:**

So, I'd like to start out by directing a question to Director Hillis. As we all know, we all received a letter from the Mayor yesterday relating to the rezoning. And I would like to understand further how the Planning Department, reacts to the letter and sort of the pathway, as you see it going forward. I know we all just received a memo from you on this, but I haven't had a chance to read it because it just came. So, maybe you could talk us through the memo.

#### **Rich Hillis, Planning Director:**

Sure. So, yeah, you should have in your email from Lisa Chen, a memo from us, basically trying to outline the steps of how we get from where we are today to a revised recommendation to you all on the rezoning. And as you know, we're under a timeline by HCD to get there by the end of next year. So, we have time, but we don't have a lot of time given the legislative process. And, you know, the amount of area we're looking at and the complications with it, so, that memo kind of lays out some of the topics and steps. And first, I just wanted to appreciate our team, Lisa Chen who's been leading this, Rachael Tanner who was on the Commission, Josh Switzky, and there are others, for their professionalism and thoughtfulness throughout this whole process. Because, as you know, it's not an easy task and the Mayor laid that out. You know, she's heard you. You've heard from folks who both say, this is going too far or this isn't going far enough, but you should know, we will continue

to kind of put forward recommendations that we think are good Planning policy, good public policy, and really use data and analysis to get there. So, I think the Mayor's letter reinforces that. She gets fairly specific on some of her recommendations, but not into the-- to the level of detail we can just change the map from looking at underutilized sites. And some of those have come up in our, in our discussions with community like Laguna Honda, add additional opportunities for six and eight-story buildings in the city, and also consider removing density limits but keeping our controls like height and rear yard in places to allow for more units in a kind of an allowable box. And even prior to the Mayor's memo, we were working on a revision to our proposal based on comments we have received from you and from others throughout this process. We're not going to have this map tomorrow. You know, this, it's fairly complicated. And there are complicated topics that you have brought up and others have brought up, and that were included in the Mayor's letter. Some of those State Density Bonus and how our local program works with State Density Bonus. The feasibility analysis. And the Mayor talked on this like, what's feasible, where are we going to get housing? What type of project is actually feasible? How our modeling, how we get to the numbers that we're required to get through under RHNA. There was an article in the paper today about kind of our modeling. We'll show you our modeling and be transparent about it. Affordable housing sites and strategies, objective design standards, which you have all pushed us on; density decontrol, how that would work as a tool; historic preservation; protecting small businesses; and just do we have the level of infrastructure and transit or how do we get there to accommodate that housing? So, we want to be thoughtful and deliberate on this. We want to bring you those topics. They may be bunched together in a couple of hearings or some of them that are more complicated may stand alone as their own hearing, because those are kind of the ingredients that will go into ultimately providing a revised map and rezoning to you all. So, that's our plan. We're happy to get your input on that approach. Topics you want to add or subtract from that list. As I said, we don't have a ton of time, but we do have time to be thoughtful and deliberate on this, and we will be. So, thank you,

**Commissioner Moore:**

Thank you, Director Hillis, for giving us a quick response. This is coming very unexpected. I do want to commend the Mayor to leading the charge to wanting to take a step back and really saying, let's do it correct. That is, I think the issue. I do hear a strong resonance with topics being brought up by other Commissions, the Board of Supervisors regarding more neighborhood focused planning. That's still leaves the objectives of priority neighborhoods, etc., all on the table. However, doing it with more neighborhood focused input, I think, is where the success of San Francisco Planning has been and where I think we continue to need to have it be focused. The one thing I would like to say, and I am not looking at anybody in this room, what I do strongly object to is that this morning the paper was full of very incendiary comments basically throwing the Planning Department under the bus and that is where my patience stops. We're sitting here as volunteers. There's nothing in this position by which we have a horse in the race. We're doing as best as we can as professionals with different backgrounds to help keep the voice open of where the community is telling us stop, listen to us, etc. However, to politicize this to the extent that the Planning Department is being thrown under the bus, that is where the buck stop for me. I'm a professional planner, I am an architect, and I am a professional urban designer, and I do believe that the Planning Department is doing everything possible, humanly possible to rise to the incredible challenges that are coming out of Sacramento. They're almost impossible to tackle by anybody on its own, because our professional education has not prepared us for that type of, I want to be diplomatic here, challenge to what we professionally do. However, for some other voices in the community to tell me that the Planning Department has known all along what they are doing that is, I think, unacceptable. So, I want to leave it with that. And I would caution that you please help the Department, that you help us to do it correctly this time around, rather than all of a sudden coming out of the woodwork and taking credit for many of the people who are writing, don't have any idea or any background to participate or have a voice. Thank you.

**Rich Hillis, Planning Director:**

Just on the memo we sent, too, has a list of kind of the community meetings we've held, and most of those are in neighborhoods with, with, groups that represent, you know, residents in that neighborhood. We'll continue to do that through this process. We've done that. We've reached out not just to residents, but beyond, you know, because there are more than just the residents that have an interest in where we're, where we're going on this. So, we will continue to do that, but I appreciate those comments.

**President Diamond:**

I will add to Commissioner Moore's comments that I believe that we have engaged in an incredibly thoughtful process so far. This is a very challenging topic to figure out how to add 82,000 units within a short period of time that actually have a strong likelihood of being built, so that it's not a paper exercise. And I have been impressed by the work of the Planning Department and the thoughtfulness in its approach, and by the community input that we have received, because we're all trying to do what's in the best interests of the city. There are different visions for how we get there, although at the end of the day, you know, we are all trying to accomplish the goal that was set by Sacramento in a way that we feel preserves, what we all value most and love about our city, but still makes room for our children, our teachers, our firefighters, you know, people of all income levels to be able to live here, stay here, and enjoy everything that our incredible city offers to us. I thought and continue to think that the work of the Department to date has been fantastic, I support the notion of having these additional hearings on these, you know, subject matter, the list of subject matters that you raised because I think we all need more understanding, as to how those specific subjects affect what the ultimate map will be. You've heard from all of us before that we really want to understand how infrastructure is keeping pace with the addition of housing. You've heard from all of us that we need to understand how what we're doing intersects with, not only existing State Density Bonus legislation, but what might arise in the future so that we don't inadvertently end up with rules that take us in a direction that we hadn't anticipated, given the overall complexity of this process. So my view is keep going, I think that the work that's been done to date has been terrific. And that taking the time to do an in-depth dive on the subject matters that you raised is absolutely appropriate. And you will continue to get feedback from all of the interested groups leading to the next, you know, version of the map that reflects the work that's done to date, in addition to what we learned from these additional hearings. So thank you, actually on behalf of the Commission, for all the work that's been done by staff, in getting us to this point in time.

**Commissioner Imperial:**

Yeah, first, I also, you know, thank the Mayor, in directing the Planning Commission and the Department to revisit the housing, the rezoning that is going to happen. And also, I guess for me, this is my question in terms of our timeline, since there's going to be additional hearings, is this going to be pushed back in terms of other informational hearings that we're about to hear? I thought that we're going to hear this, you know, kind of like updates this month, April or spring. Is that going to be, moved, moved in--

**Rich Hillis, Planning Director:**

And you've got the memo. The goal is these topics feed into the ultimate map in rezoning. Take Preservation for instance. I mean, we've had a lot of discussion at HPC, and internally, on Preservation. But I think we have to have a hearing on Preservation. And, because of changes in state law that kind of are coupled with the potential rezoning, how we preserve those assets, buildings, and cultural assets that we want to preserve. And we want to lay out a plan for you all and have community weigh in and have that baked into our rezoning proposal. So, I think these are all ingredients that will ultimately go into a kind of a future, a map. But again, we've got to do it relatively quickly because in that kind of Planning world timeline, you know, you all I mean, some of you have been here where it's taken eight years to get to kind of a plan adoption. We don't have that time, right? We've got to do this by the end of next year, and that's baking in the legislative process. So, I don't set out specific dates, but that memo kind of shows the topics and we'll try to get to them quickly. But I think we need to have those hearings. You need to understand those and give us input before we present you with kind of a new map. But I think conceptually, we'll all know kind of where it's going based on those discussions. And we've got copies of that memo too, you have it in your email. We'll post it on our website. But there's hard copies too. But again, it's more topic based, not necessarily a specific timeline.

**Commissioner Imperial:**

Yeah, I just want to also clarify in terms of, because I know that there are still ongoing outreach that is happening still, and whether, you know, and from last hearing too we kind of had an informal discussion about the outreach and the, you know, the types of that people hasn't heard about this, when we mean quickly, what did the-- what do we mean by that? Does that mean like mailers? Because that's something that we were brought up from last week's conversation.

**Rich Hillis, Planning Director:**

Yeah. And I mean we can, again, that could be part of our discussion to in an early one like how we're going to because we're you'll see the outreach we're doing. We kind of lay it out in some of the additional outreach. But I think as far as like if we were going to send a mailer based on here's the proposal that we're looking at to rezone, we'd want a proposal to send out. So, there'd be kind of issues as to when the best time to send that out. But we can talk about that as we talk about the timeline as well.

**Commissioner Moore:**

Director Hillis, I have a couple of very practical questions. Can we use these upcoming slightly slower days Thursdays, where we may actually want to cancel, to use it to have constructive questions and answers focused on our various areas of expertise to help put some new stakes in the ground and broaden the discussion of how we do this?

**Rich Hillis, Planning Director:**

Sure.

**Commissioner Moore:**

One of my questions is are we going to use ARC/GIS to basically model the city throughout in visualizing increased density, not just by a little street here or there, but we have the tools to do it differently. We have the database to do it differently.

**Rich Hillis, Planning Director:**

Yeah. I mean, my recommendation would be we'd be more topic based so experts could come and advocates and people who are interested in those topics. But if you have additional questions, concerns or topics you want us to touch on, by all means send them to us and we'll figure out kind of when to put them.

**Commissioner Moore:**

I would like to actually, as the people hear us speak about it, for example--

**Rich Hillis, Planning Director:**

Sure. No no that's what I mean by we would add them onto a calendar as a topic so we can present to you what we're doing and you can respond.

**Commissioner Moore:**

I would like to do this as quickly as possible to help you to kind of not interrupt the flow of your work, but feed and a lively discussion in the upcoming weeks to basically help you broaden the approach of how you look at this and move forward with new input and create probably different perspectives of how to solve certain problems which haven't been addressed before.

**Rich Hillis, Planning Director:**

Sure.

**Commissioner Moore:**

Another issue would be for me to look really, in a very small scale, and I think Mayor Breed sensitively touches on that, finance ability of immediate actions, construction types, lower buildings allow us X, Y, and Z, but if we go over X numbers of stories, there is another issue here, that we create practical guides, not just on the esthetic and height etc. limit, but also on the implementation limit, and then take it from there wherever it goes. But I would like to immediately get all of us actively involved in furthering the discussion.

**Rich Hillis, Planning Director:**

Yeah, absolutely.

**Commissioner Williams:**

Thank you, Director Hillis, for all your work around the Housing Element. I know it's a tremendous feat, and so I just want to, you know, give you guys, your proper due. You guys have been working hard. One thing that I haven't heard, though, is the Equity Provisions, in the Housing Element. And I'm concerned that that has been kind of, it feels to me like skipped over. And I'm talking about the Provisions 4.1.3 to 8.1.9. All those are Equity Provisions that are inside the Housing Element. And I just was curious on how we're going to, like, intertwine that into the final, rezoning.

**Rich Hillis, Planning Director:**

Yeah, a couple of things. I mean, just the effort we're doing comes out of the Housing Element, which, you know, the foundational principle of that was Equity, like where we're looking to rezone is based on, on areas that haven't seen equitable development or that they are well resourced neighborhoods. So, there's things baked in. But I get you. You know, we can highlight and we're doing an overall equity analysis of the rezoning to show that there are issues around tenant displacement that are factored in. And we've got zoning proposals or proposals that are baked into that. So, it's hard to just remove that topic from everything we're doing and saying, this is an independent topic because it's embedded in all of these topics. And what we're looking at, issues around Preservation, we're not just looking at buildings that we think, but cultural assets that that are important to communities. So, we can have a separate hearing too or part of a hearing to talk about kind of how that that weaves in. But I would anticipate too that's a topic in every one of these hearings that we're talking about.

**Commissioner Williams:**

Yeah, just reminding that this whole Housing Element is supposed to be centered on, on equity, and so I just want to just, you know, remind us, like, you know, to keep that front and center. And so it sounds like you're going to be willing to further that conversation. And with some real implementation acts or around, and baked into the Housing Element.

**Rich Hillis, Planning Director:**

Absolutely. And each of these that, you know, it should not be a standalone topic. It should be a topic that's incorporated into each of these topics. Because again, the effort that we're doing where we're rezoning, why we're rezoning in specific neighborhoods is based on the state's mandate for us to affirmatively further fair housing, but also our Housing Element, which, as you point out, was centered in equity. But again, we're happy to talk into, you know, have a topic on that as well to show kind of how that's weaved into everything, and the analysis we're doing. So yeah, I think I think, yes and to or both. And we can do that as part of each of these hearings and also have kind of a separate discussion on it as well.

**Commissioner Williams:**

Okay. Thank you.

**Rich Hillis, Planning Director:**

Yup.

**Commissioner Braun:**

So, I just want to add my thanks for the quick turnaround on the memo that describes kind of where we're at with the Expanding Housing Choice and Housing Element Zoning Program and the thoughtful approach that's been taken here to, you know, having a series of more deliberative, topic specific future hearings. I've been mostly just listening intently to what my fellow Commissioners had to say. And maybe there's some tweaks to the topics. But for the most part, I feel like the topics that have been suggested here are, at least, capturing a lot of elements of what have been raised today. You know, when we talk about the proposed local program and its relationship to the State Density Bonus, that has implications as far as both the built outcomes for the city as well as affordable housing outcomes, for the units that are built as inclusionary units with affordable housing sites and strategy, you know, that is our affordable housing, a piece of our affordable housing, approach and strategy. So, there's a lot of equity implications there. Infrastructure and small business support captures a lot of elements of, you know, our local neighborhoods and their character and preserving a lot of what makes San Francisco special. The objective design standards, this plays out in terms of, you know, ultimately what the zoning is and



what the design looks like and how that interacts with density maximums, as well as the financial feasibility analysis, which also factors into the kinds of buildings will actually get, how tall they'll be, how likely they are to get built. And then, of course, there's the Historic Preservation which was raised as an issue that impacts where we direct growth in the future. So, you know, for the most part, I'm glad to see that this a lot of the Commissioner comments have even been anticipated and kind of captured in this list. So, I'm looking forward to a lot of really robust conversations over the next couple of months. I'm glad we have extra time to address this.

**Rich Hillis, Planning Director:**

Thanks. And thank you, Jonas, for giving us a long leash on talking about a non agendized topic.

**Commissioner Moore:**

I was waiting for it.

## **D. DEPARTMENT MATTERS**

### **10. DIRECTOR'S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

None.

### **11. REVIEW OF PAST EVENTS AT THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS, BOARD OF APPEALS AND HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION**

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

**Land Use Committee**

**231221 Planning Code – Citywide Expansion of Allowable Commercial, Restaurant, and Retail Uses. Sponsors: Mayor; Engardio, Dorsey and Melgar. Staff: V. Flores.**

Last week at the Land Use Committee hearing, the committee again considered the Mayor's ordinance titled Citywide Expansion of Allowable Commercial, Restaurant, and Retail Uses. This was a duplicate of the original file, and was heard and amended the previous week.

During the hearing, Supervisor Peskin circulated a revised version that refined language related to the LCCU use sizes and cleaned up some language related to outdoor activity areas, as suggested by Planning.

Supervisor Melgar asked some clarifying questions about the amendments, which staff answered. There were no public comments. After the public comment the ordinance was amended as stated and then sent with a positive recommendation to the Full Board.

**231225 Planning Code - Tobacco Paraphernalia Establishments in North of Market Special Use District. Sponsor: Preston. Staff: Melone.**

Next the committee considered Supervisor Preston's ordinance titled Tobacco Paraphernalia Establishments in North of Market Special Use District. This ordinance was amended the previous week and continued since the amendments were substantive. At this hearing there was no public comment and no comments from the committee members. The item was forwarded to the Full Board with a positive recommendation.

**240001 Planning Code, Zoning Map - 68 Nantucket Avenue. Sponsor: Commission. Staff: Pantoja.**

Next the Committee considered a Planning Commission sponsored ordinance to rezone 68 Nantucket Ave from P to RH-1. Commissioners, you heard this item on November 2 of last year and voted to recommend approval. During the committee hearing Supervisor Melgar questions why this wasn't being zoned to

something that allowed more housing, but in the end, she was fine moving forward with the ordinance as proposed. There was no public comment, and the item was forwarded to the Full Board with a positive recommendation.

#### Full Board

[231079](#) Planning Code - Density Controls in Three Historic Districts. Sponsor: Peskin. Staff: Starr. **MAYOR'S VETO Overturned**

[231006](#) Planning Code, Zoning Map - 900 Kearny Street Special Use District. Sponsor: Peskin. Staff: V. Flores. PASSED Second Read

[240070](#) Planning Code - Exceptions and Extensions for Existing Uses. Sponsor: Planning Commission. Staff: Merlone. PASSED Second Read

[231225](#) Planning Code - Tobacco Paraphernalia Establishments in North of Market Special Use District. Sponsor: Preston. Staff: Melone. PASSED First Read

[240274](#) Calling for Full-Service Grocery Store in the Tenderloin. Sponsor: Preston. Staff: Haddadan. Adopted

#### RESULTS OF HEARINGS THIS WEEK:

##### Land Use Committee

- No Planning Department Items

#### Full Board

[231225](#) Planning Code - Tobacco Paraphernalia Establishments in North of Market Special Use District. Sponsor: Preston. Staff: Melone. PASSED Second Read

[231221](#) Planning Code – duplicated file for the Citywide Expansion of Allowable Commercial, Restaurant, and Retail Uses. Sponsors: Mayor. Staff: V. Flores. Passed First Read

[240001](#) Planning Code, Zoning Map - 68 Nantucket Avenue. Sponsor: Planning Commission. Staff: Pantoja. Passed First Read

[240162](#) Hearing - Appeal of Conditional Use Authorization Approval - 2351 Mission Street. Items 42-45. Staff: Starr

Lastly the Board considered the Conditional Use Appeal for 2351 Mission Street, otherwise known as Casement's bar. This item was heard by the Planning Commission in January of this year.

The CU was appealed by the applicant. If you recall, the applicant proposed operating hours extending until 11 p.m. on weeknights and midnight on weekends. The Planning Department recommended a 10 p.m. closure to mitigate potential noise disturbances for nearby residents. After careful consideration and public input, this commission adopted the Department's recommendation, approving the project with the 10:00 PM restriction on the OOA.

Casements appealed your decision because of the imposed 10:00 PM restriction on the OOA. In their appeal, they raise four main issues: 1) a misunderstanding of the noise issues by the public and the commission; 2) procedural irregularities during the hearing; 3) a lack of consideration and impacts to small business; 4) and past president.

The most salient issue of the appeal and the one that seemed to sway the Board the most was the impact that the 10 PM closure would have on this community centered small business. The appellant asserted that reducing the hours of operation for the OOA would significantly cut into the revenue for Casements. This would result in staff layoffs and reduced hours for existing staff. Margins are tight in the food industry, and these extra hours allow them to make things work financially.

About 40 people came out to speak in support of the appeal and Casement's itself. The public speakers included many well-known names such as Bevon Dufty, Juanita Moore, Tom Temprano, Ben Bleiman, Honey

Mahogany, and Stephen Torres. Many spoke about the establishment's community centered focus, as a refuge for families with children, the queer community, and Irish immigrants. In fact, several Irish immigrants spoke about how the bar reminded them of home, and was the most accurate representation of an actual Irish pub.

There were also about 8 speakers against the appeal. They were mostly neighbors of the subject bar who were concerned about the noise generated by Casement's.

Prior to public comment Supervisor Ronen asked Casement's sound engineer about what he recommended be done to reduce noise impact on the adjacent neighbors. He listed about three main improvements, including increasing the height of the fence, adding sound dampening materials, or removing reflective materials inside the patio, and adjusting the speaker placement. After public comment Supervisor Ronen gave some thoughtful remarks regarding the issues at hand, and then proceeded to make a motion to accept the appeal and amend the conditions of approval. The amendments would require these sound attenuation adjustments as conditions of approval, and included deadlines for their implementation. She also extended the hours of operation for the outdoor activity area until 11 p.m. on weeknights and midnight on weekends. After making the motion, Supervisor Mandelman second the motion and the vote passed unanimously.

**Corey Teague, Zoning Administrator:**

Good afternoon, President Diamond, Commissioners, Corey Teague, Zoning Administrator. Much briefer, Board of Appeals did meet last night. They did not take any final action on any cases of interest to the Planning Commission but did hear an initial appeal of, or multiple appeals, of a permit that came before you as a Discretionary Review for 45 Bernard Street. That hearing happened last night, but was continued out until May 29th to allow the project sponsor to supply some additional plans to review alternatives. But so there'll be a fuller report on the outcome of that appeal, after the Board takes a final decision on that one. Thank you.

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

The Historic Preservation Commission did meet yesterday and took up a few matters that might be of interest to the Planning Commission. The Palace Hotel is trying to renovate its neon sign, but they're trying to modify it from neon to LED and so the Historic Preservation Commission had some concerns about it. And after hearing it twice, continued it to May 1st for additional information and to hear it one more time. They also adopted the Downtown Conservation District Historic Design Standards and then approved a case and continued another.

## E. GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT

**SPEAKERS:** Georgia Schuttish – Two emails sent. One on March 26, 2024 and another on April 1, 2024. Details public comment: background/history of issue with Demo Calcs since 2015. RET not advanced. Peskin legislation not advanced. Demo Calcs never adjusted. Project in March 26 email at 1363 Sanchez illustrates "cashing out" which is a concern expressed by the Staff in 2021 analysis of SB-9 in the neighborhoods now in PEGs. Thirty year tenant in 1363 Sanchez "evicted" due to sale in 2017. Sold for \$1.7 M followed by "extreme alteration". Sold for \$4.3 M in 2023. Should also be of concern in the Well Resourced Neighborhoods. Not all homeowners are "rich". May be "house rich" while being "cash poor". 2009 Demo Calcs never being adjusted per Planning Code Section 317 (b) (2) (D) is a problem in the past, present and future. Continual problem. Ongoing. Not only in PEGs but in all neighborhoods.

Katherine Petrin – Upzoning plan, Mayor's press release

Tom – Update via mail to reach seniors, changes occurring in the neighborhood

Marie Joyce – Upzoning proposal, change to the Richmond district

## 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.

### 12a. [2007.0903PCA-03MAP-03](#)

(J. LOOK: (628) 652-7461)

**TREASURE ISLAND AND YERBA BUENA ISLAND PROJECT – Planning Code and Zoning Map Amendments** – An ordinance, sponsored by Mayor London Breed and Supervisor Matt Dorsey – the area for all of Treasure Island and Yerba Buena Island (District 6) – Request for amendments to the Planning Code to revise the Treasure Island/Yerba Buena Island Special Use District (SUD), to update the Treasure Island Bulk and Massing figure; to provide for additional circumstances that may authorize Minor Modifications to the standards in the SUD; and to modify the referral process for amending the Design for Development document. The project also seeks to revise the Zoning Map to change height districts in Treasure Island, to provide for five additional feet in certain areas, and to remove the “Special Height District” designation from two easements adjacent to Buildings 2 and 3. Commission action would also make findings of consistency with the General Plan, and the eight priority policies of Planning Code, Section 101.1, and findings of public necessity, convenience, and welfare under Planning Code, Section 302, and would affirm the Planning Department’s decision to prepare an addendum to the Final Environmental Impact report issued for the Treasure Island / Yerba Buena Project.

*Preliminary Recommendation: Approve*

**SPEAKERS:** = Jessica Look – Staff report  
 + Madison Tam, Legislative aide to Sup. Dorsey – Introduction to the ordinance  
 + AnMarie Rodgers – Treasure Island Development Authority presentation  
 + Leigh Lutenski – OEWD presentation  
 + Chris Meany – Project sponsor presentation  
 + Mauricio Chavez – Local 22 Carpenters Union  
 + Oswaldo – Carpenters Union, will create work for union laborers  
 + Sherry Williams – Affordable housing projects  
 + Nela Gonzales – Training programs  
 + Elizabeth Kuwada – Mercy Housing  
 + Pedro Mendes – NorCal Carpenters Union, enhance quality of life  
 - Jeff Kline – Risky project, radioactive items, increasing flood risk and storm damage  
 + Jamie Querubin, TIDA Finance Manager – Response to comments and questions  
 + Robert Beck, TIDA Director - Response to comments and questions

**ACTION:** Approved  
**AYES:** Williams, Braun, Imperial, Koppel, Moore, Diamond  
**ABSENT:** None  
**RESOLUTION:** [21541](#)

### 12b. [2007.0903GEN-05](#)

(J. LOOK: (628) 652-7461)

**TREASURE ISLAND AND YERBA BUENA ISLAND PROJECT – Request for Amendments to the Treasure Island and Yerba Buena Island Design for Development** - the area for all of Treasure Island and Yerba Buena Island (District 6). The proposal seeks to amend the standards, pursuant to Section 249.52. based on lessons learned in the first development subphase, address unforeseen constraints arising from updates to the California Building Code and site conditions on the islands. Commission action would also make findings of consistency with the General Plan and the eight priority policies of Planning Code, Section 101.1, and would affirm the Planning Department’s decision to prepare an addendum to the Final Environmental Impact report issued for the Treasure Island / Yerba Buena Project.

*Preliminary Recommendation: Approve*

**SPEAKERS:** Same as item 12a.  
**ACTION:** Approved  
**AYES:** Williams, Braun, Imperial, Koppel, Moore, Diamond  
**ABSENT:** None

RESOLUTION: [21542](#)

12c. [2007.0903DVA-02](#)

(J. LOOK: (628) 652-7461)

**TREASURE ISLAND AND YERBA BUENA ISLAND PROJECT** – Request for **Amendments to the Development Agreement** (“DA”) between the City and County of San Francisco and “Treasure Island Development Corporation LLC” in association with the Treasure Island/Yerba Buena Island Project. The proposal seeks to amend the Financing Plan exhibit to the Development Agreement, pursuant to Administrative Code Section 56.15, to conform with proposed changes being made to the Financing Plan as attached to the Disposition and Development Agreement (“DDA”). Amendments to the Financing Plan describe the City’s intent to accelerate revenues into the project for the purpose of ensuring Stage 2 of the project is financially feasible and proceeds. The proposed amendment makes certain other changes to DA Exhibit A, Project Site, to reflect revisions to the Marina lease boundaries; DA Exhibit B, Legal Description, to reflect revisions to the Marina lease boundaries; and, DA Exhibit C, Project Approvals, to reflect revisions to the Project Approvals consistent with amendments to certain documents as included in the DDA Amendment. The subject site is currently within the Treasure Island/Yerba Buena Special Use District (SUD) and 25-TI – 450 Flex Zone-TI Height and Bulk District and 35-Low Rise YBI – 75-Mid Rise YBI Height and Bulk District. Commission action would also make findings of consistency with the General Plan, and the eight priority policies of Planning Code, Section 101.1, and would affirm the Planning Department’s decision to prepare an addendum to the Final Environmental Impact report issued for the Treasure Island / Yerba Buena Project.

*Preliminary Recommendation: Approve*

SPEAKERS: Same as item 12a.

ACTION: Approved as Amended to include a Finding read into the record by Commission President Diamond, with a reference to the LEED Platinum Certification for “Neighborhood Design”

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

ABSENT: None

RESOLUTION: [21543](#)

13. [2020-005089PRJ](#)

(K. AGNIHOTRI: (628) 652-7454)

**3501 CESAR CHAVEZ ST (MISSION BERNAL CARE COMPLEX)** – **Informational Presentation** – Staff and project sponsor will update the Commission on the final design for the Medical Office Building. The Mission Bernal Campus Medical Office Building (MOB) is a five-story building, measuring approximately 129,000 sq ft, including health services/medical office space, retail and parking on four below-ground levels including approximately 210 parking spaces. As part of the project approval, previously approved with Development Agreement (DA) with California Pacific Medical Center (CPMC), the CPMC is required to provide an informational presentation to the Planning Commission to update them on the final design for the Medical Office Building (MOB).

*Preliminary Recommendation: None – Informational*

SPEAKERS: = Kalyani Agnihotri – Staff report  
+ Karthik Ramadurai – Project sponsor presentation  
- Robert Kollman – Guerrero park in terrible disrepair  
+ Bahar – Response to comments and questions  
= Liz Watty – Response to comments and questions  
= Elizabeth Purl – Response to comments and questions

ACTION: Reviewed and Commented

14. [2021-010333CUA](#)

(C. ENCHILL: (628) 652-7551)

**600 20TH STREET** – northwest corner of Illinois Street; Lot 002 in Assessor’s Block 4058 (District 10) – Request for **Conditional Use Authorization**, pursuant to Planning Code Sections 303 and 317 to remove an Unauthorized Dwelling Unit (UDU) to allow demolition of the existing two-story, 9,200 sq ft commercial building and construction of a five-story, 67-ft 9-in tall, 24,961 sq ft mixed-use building containing 5,214 sq ft ground-floor laboratory use (non-life science), 10,822 sq ft office use (second and third floors), 4,077 sq ft arts activities use

(fourth floor), 4,077 sq. ft. residential use consisting of one three-bedroom dwelling unit (fifth floor), and containing one residential off-street parking space, one non-residential off-street loading space, four Class 1 bicycle parking spaces, and eight Class 2 bicycle parking spaces within a UMU Zoning District. The Project Site is located within an UMU (Urban Mixed Use) Zoning District, Fringe Financial Service Restricted Use District and 68-X Height and Bulk District. The Planning Department issued a general 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*

SPEAKERS: = Charles Enchill – Staff report  
 + John Kevlin – Project sponsor presentation  
 + Will Mollard – Design presentation  
 ACTION: Approved with Conditions as amended by Staff  
 AYES: Williams, Braun, Imperial, Koppel, Moore, Diamond  
 ABSENT: None  
 MOTION: [21544](#)

## 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.

### 15a. [2020-004486DRP-02](#)

(D. WINSLOW: (628) 652-7335)

**820 LAGUNA HONDA BOULEVARD** – west side between Rockaway Avenue and Idora Avenue; Lot 014 in Assessor's Block 2916 (District 7) – Request for **Discretionary Review** of Building Permit No. 2022.0503.3449 to legalize a three-story, 10' x 25' rear extension to a single-family building that was constructed without the benefit of a permit existing two-story over basement, single-family building within a RH-1(D) (Residential House- Single Family – Detached) Zoning District and 40-X Height and Bulk District. Planning Code Section 134 requires the subject property to maintain a rear yard equivalent to 30 percent of the lot depth, which ranges from 23 feet 9 inches to 28 feet 7 inches for the subject property. A portion of the building proposed to be legalized extends into the required rear yard. Therefore, a variance is required. 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 Conditions*

SPEAKERS: = David Winslow – Staff report  
 - Tony Hall – DR 1 presentation  
 - Karen Tarantola – DR 2 presentation  
 + Steven Hammond – Project sponsor presentation  
 + Audrey Pulliam – Issue is more situational, neighbors used to be friends  
 - Michael Antonini – Sanborn maps  
 - Steven Mario Pinto – Corruption in the approval process  
 - Carl Windarf – Undermines integrity of zoning laws  
 - Fr. Mike Crane – Property value, no deck  
 + Speaker – Situational, supports variance  
 + Trisha McCallum – Situational, supports variance  
 + Bill Maher – Supports variance, falling out between friends  
 + Ralph Nunez – Falling out between friends  
 + Alonzo Bennett – To spend more time with the kids  
 + Eileen Bennet – Situational  
 + Sheila – Supports variance  
 + Speaker – Proposed fence height  
 + Peter – No political favors  
 + Bobby Kohlman – Integrity of the process

- Matt Gonzales – Merit, planning code  
+ Nora Hall – DR rebuttal  
= Corey Teague – Response to comments and questions  
= Kristen Jensen – Response to comments and questions  
+ Bill O’Keefe – Response to comments and questions  
= Rich Hillis – Response to comments and questions

ACTION: Took DR approving the BPA, and adding condition that an NSR be recorded to require any BP for exterior construction would require neighborhood notice.

AYES: Braun, Imperial, Moore, Diamond

NAYS: Williams, Koppel

ABSENT: None

DRA: [854](#)

- 15b. [2020-004486VAR](#) (J. HORN: (628) 652-7366)  
820 LAGUNA HONDA BOULEVARD – west side between Rockaway Avenue and Idora Avenue; Lot 014 of Assessor’s Block 2916 (District 7) – Request for **Variance** to address the Planning Code requirements for rear yard [PC 134] to legalize a three-story, 10’ x 25’ rear extension to a single-family building that was constructed without the benefit of a permit to an existing two-story over basement, single-family building within a RH-1(D) (Residential House- Single Family - Detached) Zoning District and 40-X Height and Bulk District.

SPEAKERS: Same as item 15a.

ACTION: ZA closed the PH and indicated an intent to Grant, with a condition that any additional rear construction would trigger a Staff-initiated DR.

**ADJOURNMENT 4:46 PM**

**ADOPTED APRIL 25, 2024**