

SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING COMMISSION



Meeting Minutes Remote Hearing via video and teleconferencing

**Thursday, May 6, 2021
1:00 p.m.
Regular Meeting**

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Tanner, Chan, Diamond, Fung, Imperial, Moore, Koppel
COMMISSIONERS ABSENT: None

THE MEETING WAS CALLED TO ORDER BY PRESIDENT KOPPEL AT 1:00 PM

STAFF IN ATTENDANCE: Aaron Starr, Michael Li, Claudine Asbagh, Jenny Delumo, Stephanie Cisneros, Kate Conner, Jeff Horn, David Winslow, Corey Teague – Zoning Administrator, 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.

2. [2019-019373DRP](#) (D. WINSLOW: (628) 652-7335)
217 HUGO STREET – between 3rd and 4th Avenues; Lot 024 in Assessor's Block 1752 (District 5) – Request for **Discretionary Review** of Building Permit Application nos. 2019.0730.7350 and 2019.0730.7351 to demolish an existing one-story commercial building and construct a three-story over garage building with two dwelling units within a RH-2 (Residential

House, Two-Family) Zoning District and 40-X Height and Bulk District. This 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 as Modified

SPEAKERS: Speaker – Continue
Val - Continue
ACTION: Continued to May 13, 2021
AYES: Tanner, Chan, Diamond, Fung, Imperial, Moore, Koppel

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

1. [2021-000186CUA](#) (C. MAY: (628) 652-7359)
[2675 GEARY BOULEVARD](#) – located on the southeast corner of Geary Boulevard and Masonic Avenue; Lot 001 in Assessor's Block 1094 (District 5) – Request for a **Conditional Use Authorization**, pursuant to Planning Code Sections 303 and 303.1 and 712 to establish a formula retail use (d.b.a. Bank of America) within the vacant one-story building, recently constructed fronting onto the east side of Masonic Avenue within a NC-3 (Moderate Scale Neighborhood Commercial District) Zoning District and 40-X and 80-D Height and Bulk Districts. This 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: Tanner, Chan, Diamond, Fung, Imperial, Moore, Koppel
MOTION: [20908](#)

C. COMMISSION MATTERS

3. Consideration of Adoption:
 - [Draft Minutes for April 22, 2021](#)

SPEAKERS: None
ACTION: Adopted
AYES: Tanner, Chan, Diamond, Fung, Imperial, Moore, Koppel

4. Commission Comments/Questions

Commissioner Moore:

I wanted to comment on a memo we received from Ms. Pantoja in the response to our request for further clarification on the landscape plan for 0 Guttenberg Street. While I appreciate that indeed modifications to the plant material was made, and I really

appreciate the department reviewing this material, I am still not satisfied with the response to our request to really consider not using artificial turf. I believe that the answer to that was given to us as insufficient and does not really get to the matter of what is important to this Commission. I would like to hear other Commissioners to comment on it. I also did not necessarily appreciate the tone of not having any alternatives being presented because there are ample alternatives for providing a people friendly appropriate surfacing of this small garden area. I would be curious to hear what other Commissioners have to say.

Commissioner Imperial:

Thank you, Commissioner Moore. I too also agree with Commissioner Moore on the O Guttenberg. I feel like it needs to go back to the drawing board in terms of the landscaping. I do think that perhaps a gravel will be -- a different kind of material would be more sufficient. But I do think it has to come back again for the Planning Commission to - -

Jonas P. Ionin, Commission Secretary:

Commissioners I apologize. I am going to interrupt the conversation. Only because O Guttenberg is not on today's agenda for discussion purposes. I mean, certainly Commissioner Moore can make her comments. But once we start discussing items that are not on today's agenda, I am sorry I will have to prevent that from going any further. If you would like to have a discussion, we should schedule it at a future hearing. And we can certainly put it on next week's hearing for your discussion.

Commissioner Moore:

Okay. I would ask then as your maker of the request that this be put on next week's discussion item. And we can revisit this together.

Jonas P. Ionin, Commission Secretary:

So noted. Thank you.

Commissioner Diamond:

I was going to support the request made by Commissioner Moore.

Commissioner Tanner:

I just wanted to comment on the other memo that we received more recently. I think it may have been today or yesterday about the Equity Council. And I just wanted to congratulate all the folks who are volunteering and giving their time to the Equity Council. I know it is continuing to develop. And so, I am very just happy to see a group of folks who will be helping the Department to continue to work on advancing our equity resolution. I don't know Director, if there is any update that you would be able to provide -- if we may have some interaction with that Council, or how staff maybe engaging with that Council. If you are aware and could shed a little light on that?

Rich Hillis, Planning Director:

Sure. And I was going to bring this up during my report to make sure you saw that memo you pointed out. As you saw from the memo, and the goal is to advise us, primarily staff, on our policies and how we elevate voices. Particularly Black Americans and other communities of color in our process. We will inform you of these meetings. Certainly we can't have a quorum of Commissioners at them but would welcome involvement. Certainly

we will come back here and report back to you on the discussions we have been having. We are hoping to meet monthly with the Council, maybe early on even adding an additional meeting. We will definitely report back. We will also let you know when those meetings are happening and the topics.

Commissioner Tanner:

Thank you.

Commissioner Moore:

I only want to briefly ask what time of the day was it sent yesterday? Because I, particularly before meetings, very carefully check my e-mail and I don't think I got it.

Rich Hillis, Planning Director:

I think it was sent out last week. But if you didn't get it, let us know and -

Commissioner Moore:

If you wouldn't mind, I would appreciate it. Because I am normally pretty thorough but I did not see it. May be my fault.

Rich Hillis, Planning Director:

Okay.

D. DEPARTMENT MATTERS

5. [Director's Announcements](#)

Rich Hillis, Planning Director:

And just a little additional info on the Council. And there is information on our website as well for the public including who is on the Advisory Council. It is made up of 11 community leaders dedicated to working to advance Racial and Social Justice. Some familiar with our processes in the Planning Commission. I think you will recognize some of the names from your work on the Commission but some who aren't. And we thought that was a good idea to bring both leaders, who are familiar with our work as well as those who may not be. So in addition to, as I said deepening our engagement and advising us on how to deepen our engagement, we are looking for specific advise and input from the Council on our work around Housing Element and other General Plan updates, our budgeting and programmatic priorities, implementation of our Phase 1 of our Racial and Social Equity Plan as well as development of Phase 2. Please let us know if you have questions. It was an inter-Departmental effort in forming the council. So, I want to thank HRC and ORE as well as OEWD and Supervisor's offices who we consulted for their advice and thank Miriam Chion and Tameeka Bennet for their work. But particularly thank the Council for their willingness to participate.

I also want to give you some news on the Permit Center at 49 South Van Ness expansion of in Person services there. Today was a soft launch of expansion of some services. Next Monday, May 10th will be an official launch of expanding over-the-counter permitting at the Permit Center. This is the first step to getting the Permit Center back up and running. So customers will still need to make appointments and will continue with the other permitting agencies, DBI, etc., to handle the same volume of over the counter permits. But

customers will be able to walk their plans to review stations as they did in the past rather than dropping them off. And obviously with the goal of getting same day approval which isn't feasible with just dropping off the permits. And over the next couple months we plan to phase out the need for appointments all together. And throughout this process, obviously we have been mindful of employee and customer safety. The Permit Center has updated its health and safety plan which has been approved by DHR and DPH. So, I wanted to give thanks, particularly to our PIC staff for their continued flexibility throughout this entire year as we have adapted our services in response to the pandemic; and that is my report. Thank you.

Commissioner Moore:

Thank you for that report Director Hillis. I would like to tag on a quick question and maybe premature. Is there any possibility for getting an invitation to see the building? Perhaps in a small group or is that still a little bit into the future?

Rich Hillis, Planning Director:

It probably can happen. So, let me look into it and we can send out an invitation because I think would be great for you all to see it.

Commissioner Moore:

I think it would be great for all of us. Thank you.

6. Review of Past Events at the Board of Supervisors, Board of Appeals and Historic Preservation Commission

Aaron Starr, Manager of Legislative Affairs:

Good afternoon commissioners, Aaron Starr, Manager of Legislative Affairs.

- 210353 Supporting California State Senate Bill No. 37 (Cortese) - Contaminated Sites. Sponsors: Mar; Walton, Melgar, Peskin, Preston, Chan and Haney. Staff: Gibson. Item 2

This week the Land Use Committee held a hearing on a proposed Resolution, put forth by Supervisor Mar, that supports Senate Bill 37.

SB 37 would, among other things, prohibit projects that are located on a site listed on the Cortese List from receiving a Commonsense exemption. Sites on the Cortese list have hazardous substances in the soil, left from old underground fuel heating tanks, and old gas stations. Projects on these sites are currently not allowed to receive a Categorical Exemption.

Prior to this resolution being introduced by Supervisor Mar, the Planning Department had flagged this state bill because it would significantly change the way we deal with CEQA determinations for projects on listed sites.

Unlike other jurisdictions in California, most projects in San Francisco are discretionary. This means that any building permit the city issues needs an environmental determination. We currently issue Cat Ex determinations for most small projects, like window and door replacements or changes of use. In other jurisdictions these would be considered ministerial and not need a CEQA determination. Because current law prohibits

us from issuing a Cat Ex on Cortese sites, we use what is called a commonsense exemption for smaller projects that don't disturb the soil. Removing the ability for us to issue a commonsense exemption would mean that these small projects, even if there isn't any soil disruption, would require a Negative Declaration. Negative Declarations are much more time consuming and costly, start at \$30,000 in Planning fees compared to about \$300 for a Commonsense Exemption.

During the hearing, the Committee heard from Supervisor Mar, Ryan Mickle who represented Senator Cortese's office, Lisa Gibson, and Richard Drury of Lozeau Drury, LLP.

Staff presentation described how our process is different than most jurisdiction in California, and how removing the possibility for commonsense exemptions would impact everything from small homeowners to low-income housing projects. This argument seemed to resonate with Supervisor Mar the sponsor of the Resolution, as well as Supervisor Melgar, but Supervisor Peskin appeared defensive and argumentative. He continually interrupted staff's presentation and at one point challenged staff's assertion that it cost \$30,000 for a Negative Declaration. Once it was confirmed that the Planning fees for a Neg Dec do start at \$30,000 he suggested reducing those fees. He didn't say how we would do that, since we are a cost recovery department.

There were several speakers during public comment. All seemed to support the Resolution, with only one or two expressing sympathy for staff's concerns.

At the end of public comment, Chair Melgar asked Senator Cortese's staff if they would be open to clarifying in the legislation that it should not apply to small projects. Senator Cortese's aide, Ryan Mickle, confirmed that the Senator's intention is to target projects that move large amounts of soil. They would be willing to consider exceptions for small projects. Supervisor Peskin moved to amend the resolution to incorporate non-substantive revisions proposed by Supervisor Mar at the beginning of the hearing but did not include modifications based on Staff's concerns. This motion passed unanimously. Supervisor Peskin then moved that Resolution supporting SB 37 be recommended as amended as a Committee report, which also passed unanimously. So in the end, the resolution does not recommend that the legislation be amended to not apply to small projects or otherwise address concerns raised by staff.

Full Board

- 210286 Planning Code - Landmark Designation - Lyon-Martin House, 651 Duncan Street. Sponsor: Mandelman, Preston. Staff: LaValley. Passed First Read
- 210353 Supporting California State Senate Bill No. 37 (Cortese) - Contaminated Sites. Sponsors: Mar; Walton, Melgar, Peskin, Preston, Chan and Haney. Staff: Gibson. Adopted

Jonas P. Ionin, Commission Secretary:

There is no report from the Board of Appeals. The Historic Preservation Commission did meet yesterday and took action on a couple of items. The one significant item was the Landmark Designation of The Making of the Fresco Showing the Building of the City mural that was painted in the building of 800 Chestnut Street by Diego Rivera. And although 800 Chestnut Street in and of itself is a landmarked building, Supervisor Peskin nominated the

fresco itself as an individual landmark. And the Historic Preservation Commission adopted a recommendation for approval.

E. GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT

SPEAKERS: Georgia Schuttish – Approximately 20 Noe Valley projects had full hearings either as MDR or CUA since Section 317 was implemented in 2008. Staff may be worried if the Demo Calcs are adjusted per Section 317 (b) (2) (D) (which is a tool the Commission is empowered to use) the Commission will be inundated...flooded with CUAs. The intent of Section 317 was not to limit Commission hearings but to preserve sound housing while allowing for reasonable Alterations that did not veer into illegal Demolitions. That is the policy because existing housing is more affordable...or Relatively Affordable. 41 Clipper approved as an Alteration in 2013 is like so many other Noe Valley projects illustrating the fact that housing has been "prioritized as a commodity rather than a human right." Email sent Monday May 3, 2021 re: 41 Clipper History. Email sent Thursday May 6, 2021 re: Housing as a Commodity per Staff.
Linda Chapman – Return to City Hall, zoning maps

F. REGULAR CALENDAR

The Commission Hearing Procedures provide for presentations by staff; followed by the project sponsor team; followed by public comment for and against the proposal. Please be advised that the project sponsor team includes: the sponsor(s) or their designee, lawyers, architects, engineers, expeditors, and/or other advisors.

7. [2015-009955ENV](#) (M. Li: (628) 652-7538)
1525 PINE STREET – between Van Ness Avenue and Polk Street, Lot 020 in Assessor's Block 0667 (District 3) – Appeal to the **Preliminary Mitigated Negative Declaration** for the demolition of an existing one-story restaurant and the construction of a new eight-story, 83-foot-tall building containing 21 dwelling units and approximately 2,855 square feet of commercial space within the Polk NCD (Neighborhood Commercial District) Zoning District, Lower Polk Street Alcohol Restricted Use Special Use District, and 65-A Height and Bulk District.
Preliminary Recommendation: Uphold
 (Continued from Regular hearing on March 18, 2021)

SPEAKERS: = Michael Li – Staff presentation
 = Claudine Asbagh – Staff report
 - David Cincotta – Appellant
 - Trisha - Appellant
 + Toby Morris – Project sponsor
 + Alexis Pelosi – Project sponsor
 + Shah Ali - Support
 + Lee – Support, more small units
 - Teresa – loss of light
 - Speaker – Light
 - Speaker – Light

+ Corey Smith – Support
 + Don – Support
 - Speaker – Traffic, height, light
 - Samantha – Light, housing trend during pandemic, traffic
 + Duncan Ly – Support
 - Speaker – Light
 + Theodore Randolph – Support
 + Daniel – Support
 - Michael Nulty – More mediation
 + Harry Virginia – Support
 - Speaker – Height limits
 + Speaker – Support
 + Dr. Betty Sullivan - Support
 = Jenny Delumo – Response to questions
 = Stephanie Cisneros – Response to questions
 = Kate Conner – Response to questions
 - Speaker – Concerns being dismissed
 = Kate Stacy – City attorney

ACTION: Upheld
 AYES: Tanner, Chan, Diamond, Fung, Koppel
 NAYS: Imperial, Moore
 MOTION: [20909](#)

8. [2015-009955CUA](#) (C. ASBAGH: (628) 652- 7329)
1525 PINE STREET – between Van Ness Avenue and Polk Street, Lot 020 in Assessor's Block 0667 (District 3) – Request for **Conditional Use Authorization** pursuant to Planning Code Section 303 and other applicable Sections as follows: Development on a Large Lot (Section 121.1), Non-Residential Use Size (Section 121.2), Dwelling Unit Mix (Section 207.6), and Operating Hours (Section 723). Request for State Density Bonus pursuant to Planning Code Section 206.6 to achieve an additional six units over the base density of 15 units, for a total of 21 units, with one Concession or Incentive for Permitted Obstructions (Section 136), and Waivers requested from the minimum requirements for Rear Yard (Section 134), Common Useable Open Space (Section 135), Dwelling Unit Exposure (Section 140), Ground-Floor Ceiling Height (Section 145.1(c)(4), Transparency (Section 145.1(c)(6), Height (Section 260), Setbacks on Narrow Streets (Section 261.1), and Bulk (Section 270). The project would demolish an existing 1,661 square foot one-story commercial restaurant (dba "Grubstake") and construct a new 83-foot tall eight-story mixed-use building with a 2,856 square foot restaurant and 21 dwelling units within the Polk NCD (Neighborhood Commercial District) Zoning District, Lower Polk Street Alcohol Restricted Use Special Use District, and 65-A Height and Bulk District. This 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 March 18, 2021)

SPEAKERS: Same as item 8.
 ACTION: After hearing and closing public comment; Continued to June 17, 2021 with direction to explore a project that provides more light and air to the adjacent tenants.
 AYES: Tanner, Chan, Diamond, Fung, Koppel

NAYS: Imperial, Moore

9. [2019-020740CUA](#) (C. ASBAGH: (628) 652- 7329)
468 TURK STREET – north side of Turk Street between Larkin and Hyde Streets; Lot 006 of Assessor's Block 0336 (District 6) – Request for **Conditional Use Authorization**, pursuant to Planning Code Sections 209.3, 253 and 303, to allow construction of a residential base project exceeding 50 feet in height at the street frontage for a project that would construct a new nine-story, 86-ft tall, residential building (approximately 35,090 square feet) with 101 group housing units, and making findings of eligibility for the individually requested State Density Bonus. The project would utilize the State Density Bonus law (California Government Code Sections 65915-65918) and receive waivers for: height limit (Planning Code Sec. 260) upper story setback (Planning Code Sec. 132.2), and rear yard (Planning Code Sec. 134) requirements of the planning code. The project site is located within a RC-4 (Residential – Commercial, High Density) Zoning District, North of Market Special Use District Subarea 1, Uptown Tenderloin Historic District, and 80-T Height and Bulk District. This 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 April 15, 2021)
Note: On April 15, 2021, after hearing and closing public comment, continued to May 6, 2021 by a vote of +7 -0.

SPEAKERS: = Claudine Asbagh – Staff presentation
 + Mark Macy – Project sponsor
 + Brett Gladstone – Project sponsor
 - Eric Arguello – Social equity, accessibility for the disabled public
 + Corey Smith – SB330, State density bonus law
 - Chris Bradford – Group housing
 - Speaker – Modern day redlining
 - David Elliott Lewis – Project will harm neighborhood, units inadequate
 - Michael Nulty – Not equitable way to treat the neighborhood
 = Kate Conner – Response to questions
 ACTION: Approved with Conditions as amended to include the minimum kitchen appliances as listed by the Project Sponsor.
 AYES: Tanner, Chan, Diamond, Fung, Imperial, Moore, Koppel
 MOTION: [20910](#)

10. [2021-001979CUA](#) (J. HORN: (628) 652-7366)
141 LELAND AVENUE – southeast corner of the intersection of Leland Avenue and Peabody Street, Lots 014 through 020 in Assessor's Block 2650 (District 10) – Request for **Conditional Use Authorization** pursuant to Planning Code Sections 303 and Interim Zoning Control 2019-017654PCA, Enactment Number 190908, passed by the Board of Supervisors on October 11, 2019 and for Concession/Incentive and Waiver from Development Standards, pursuant to Planning Code Section 206.6 and California Government Code Section 65915 pursuant to State Density Bonus Law for a change of use from a residential care facility (Institutional Use) to group housing (Residential Use) within a NC-2 (Neighborhood Commercial - Small Scale) Zoning District, 40-X Height and Bulk District and the Visitacion Valley/Schlage Special Use District. This 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: = Jeff Horn – Staff presentation
+ Bill Musick – Project sponsor
+ Sue Hestor – Non-profits are doing the right thing
- Bran Martin – Neighborhood should know what's happening (Leland St. project)
+ Speaker – Support
- Noreen – Oppose Dolores St. project
+ Michael Nulty – Support
+ Helen Hale - MOHCD
ACTION: Approved with Conditions
AYES: Tanner, Chan, Diamond, Fung, Imperial, Moore, Koppel
MOTION: [20911](#)

- 11a. [2021-002277CUA](#) (J. HORN: (628) 652-7366)
220 DOLORES STREET – west side of Dolores Street, between 15th and 16th Streets, Lot 003A in Assessor's Block 3557 (District 8) – Request for **Conditional Use Authorization** pursuant to Planning Code Sections 303 and Interim Zoning Control 2019-017654PCA, Enactment Number 190908, passed by the Board of Supervisors on October 11, 2019 for a change of use from a residential care facility (Institutional Use) to group housing (Residential Use) within a RTO (Residential Transit Oriented) Zoning District and 40-X Height and Bulk District. This action constitutes the Approval Action for the project for the purposes of CEQA, pursuant to San Francisco Administrative Code Section [31.04\(h\)](#).
Preliminary Recommendation: Approve with Conditions

SPEAKERS: Same as item 10.
ACTION: Approved with Conditions
AYES: Tanner, Chan, Diamond, Fung, Imperial, Moore, Koppel
MOTION: [20912](#)

- 11b. [2021-002277VAR](#) (J. HORN: (628) 652-7366)
220 DOLORES STREET – west side of Dolores Street, between 15th and 16th Streets, Lot 003A in Assessor's Block 3557 (District 8) – Request for **Variances** from the rear yard and dwelling unit exposure requirements of Planning Code Sections 134 and 140. The subject property is located within a RTO (Residential Transit Oriented) Zoning District and 40-X Height and Bulk District.

SPEAKERS: Same as item 10.
ACTION: ZA closed the public hearing and indicated an intent to Grant

- 12a. [2021-002736CUA](#) (J. HORN: (628) 652-7366)
129 HYDE STREET – west side of Hyde Street, between Turk Street and Golden Gate Avenue, Lot 003 in Assessor's Block 0346 (District 6) – Request for **Conditional Use Authorization** pursuant to Planning Code Sections 303 and Interim Zoning Control 2019-017654PCA, Enactment Number 190908, passed by the Board of Supervisors on October 11, 2019 for a change of use from a residential care facility (Institutional Use) to group

housing (Residential Use) within a C-3-G (Downtown- General) Zoning District and 80-X Height and Bulk District. This action constitutes the Approval Action for the project for the purposes of CEQA, pursuant to San Francisco Administrative Code Section [31.04](#)(h).

Preliminary Recommendation: Approve with Conditions

SPEAKERS: Same as item 10.
 ACTION: Approved with Conditions
 AYES: Tanner, Chan, Diamond, Fung, Imperial, Moore, Koppel
 MOTION: [20913](#)

- 12b. [2021-002736VAR](#) (J. HORN: (628) 652-7366)
129 HYDE STREET – west side of Hyde Street, between Turk Street and Golden Gate Avenue, Lot 003 in Assessor's Block 0346 (District 6) – Request for a **Variance** from the rear yard requirements of Planning Code Section 134. The subject property is located within a C-3-G (Downtown- General) Zoning District and 80-X Height and Bulk District.

SPEAKERS: Same as item 10.
 ACTION: ZA closed the public hearing and indicated an intent to Grant

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.

13. [2013.0 846DRP](#) (D. WINSLOW: (628) 652-7335)
140-142 JASPER PLACE – between Union and Filbert Streets; Lot 032 in Assessor's Block 0103 (District 3) – Request for **Discretionary Review** of Building Permit No. 2014.0627.9672 for the construction of a third-floor vertical addition set back 12 feet from front building wall, reconfigure the rear wall, and retrofit the basement level to expand the lower unit of an existing three-story, two-family house within a RM-2 (Residential-Mixed, Moderate Density) Zoning District and 40-X Height and Bulk District. This 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 April 29, 2021)

SPEAKERS: = David Winslow – Staff report
 - Stan Hayes - DR
 + Peter Wilson – Project sponsor
 - Theresa Flandrick – Maintain current affordable family housing
 - Howard Wong – Add ADU
 - David Cincotta – Do not approve
 = Kate Stacy – City attorney
 ACTION: No DR, Approved with a Finding recognizing the rent-controlled status of the building.
 AYES: Tanner, Chan, Diamond, Fung, Koppel

NAYS: Imperial, Moore
DRA: [749](#)

ADJOURNMENT 5:37 PM
ADOPTED MAY 20, 2021