

# SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING COMMISSION

## DRAFT – Meeting Minutes

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

**Thursday, June 5, 2014**  
**12:00 p.m.**  
**Regular Meeting**

**COMMISSIONERS PRESENT:** Wu, Fong, Antonini, Borden, Hillis, Moore, Sugaya

**THE MEETING WAS CALLED TO ORDER BY PRESIDENT WU AT 12:11 P.M.**

**STAFF IN ATTENDANCE:** John Rahaim – Planning Director, Scott Sanchez – Zoning Administrator, Kanishka Burns, AnMarie Rodgers, Marcelle Boudreaux, Tina Chang, Elizabeth Purl, Claudia Flores, Doug Vu, Glenn Cabrerros, and Jonas P. Ionin – Commission Secretary

### **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. 2013.0936UT (K. BURNS: (415) 575-9112)  
FORMULA RETAIL AND LARGE-SCALE RETAIL CONTROLS - The Planning Commission will consider a draft Ordinance amending the Planning Code to amend the definition of formula retail to include businesses that have 20 or more outlets worldwide; expand the applicability of formula retail controls to other types of uses; require Conditional Use Authorization for formula retail establishments in the C-3-G district with facades facing Market Street, between 6<sup>th</sup> Street and Van Ness Avenue; expand the applicability of formula retail controls to create a new administrative review process for the authorization of a new formula retail operator at a parcel that had previously received a Conditional Use Authorization for the same formula retail use type and size, which will include new notification procedures, performance standards, and a process for requiring Conditional

Use Authorization when the performance standards are not met or upon request; remove the requirement for Conditional Use authorization when a formula retail establishment changes operator but remains the same size and use category and instead; require the new administrative review; amend the Conditional Use criteria for Large-Scale Retail Uses to require an economic impact study and establish new fees for said study; and adopting findings, including environmental findings, Section 302 findings and findings of consistency with the General Plan and Planning Code Section 101.1.

**(Proposed for Continuance to July 17, 2014)**

SPEAKERS: None  
 ACTION: Continued to July 17, 2014  
 AYES: Wu, Antonini, Borden, Moore, Sugaya  
 ABSENT: Hillis, Fong

2. 2013.1166T (A. RODGERS: (415) 558-6395)  
AMENDMENT TO THE PLANNING CODE SECTIONS 303(I) (FORMULA RETAIL USES) 703.3 (NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL DISTRICTS: FORMULA RETAIL USES) [BOARD FILE NO. 130788] - **Ordinance introduced by Supervisor Mar** to expand the definition of formula retail to include businesses that have eleven or more other outlets worldwide, and to included businesses 50% or more owned by formula retail businesses; expand the notification procedures for formula retail applications; require an economic impact report as part of the formula retail conditional use application; and adopting findings, including environmental findings, Planning Code Section 302 findings, and findings of consistency with the General Plan and the priority policies of Planning Code Section 101.

Preliminary Recommendation: Pending

(Continued from Regular Meeting of May 1, 2014)

**(Proposed for Continuance to July 17, 2014)**

SPEAKERS: None  
 ACTION: Continued to July 17, 2014  
 AYES: Wu, Antonini, Borden, Moore, Sugaya  
 ABSENT: Hillis, Fong

## 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. 2014.0514Q (M. BOUDREAUX: (415) 575-9140)  
3520-3524 17<sup>TH</sup> STREET - cross streets Guerrero and Dolores; Lot 014 in Assessor's Block 3567 - **Request for Condominium Conversion Subdivision** to convert a three-story-over-garage, three-unit building and a two-story, two-unit building into five residential condominiums within a RM-1 (Mixed, Apartments and Houses, Low 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 Section 31.04(h) of the San Francisco Administrative Code.

## Preliminary Recommendation: Approve

SPEAKERS: None  
 ACTION: Approved  
 AYES: Wu, Antonini, Borden, Moore, Sugaya  
 ABSENT: Hillis, Fong  
 MOTION: 19161

4. 2014.0489C (T. CHANG: (415) 575-9197)  
1011 GARFIELD STREET - south side of Garfield Street at Beverly Street; Lot 001 in Assessor's Block 7000 - **Request for Conditional Use Authorization**, pursuant to Planning Code Sections 204.2, 209.3 and 302, to legalize an existing childcare facility providing less than 24-hour care for 15 or more children within a RH-1 (Residential, House – One-Family) Zoning District and 40-X Height and Bulk District. This action constitutes the Approval Action for the project for purposes of CEQA, pursuant to Section 31.04(h) of the San Francisco Administrative Code.

Preliminary Recommendation: Approve with Conditions

SPEAKERS: None  
 ACTION: Approved with Conditions  
 AYES: Wu, Antonini, Borden, Moore, Sugaya  
 ABSENT: Hillis, Fong  
 MOTION: 19162

## C. COMMISSION MATTERS

5. Consideration of Adoption:
- Draft Minutes for May 15, 2014
  - Draft Minutes for May 22, 2014

SPEAKERS: None  
 ACTION: Adopted as Amended  
 AYES: Wu, Antonini, Borden, Moore, Sugaya  
 ABSENT: Hillis, Fong

Adoption of Commission Minutes – Charter Section 4.104 requires all commissioners to vote yes or no on all matters unless that commissioner is excused by a vote of the Commission. Commissioners may not be automatically excluded from a vote on the minutes because they did not attend the meeting.

6. Commission Comments/Questions
- Inquiries/Announcements. Without discussion, at this time Commissioners may make announcements or inquiries of staff regarding various matters of interest to the Commissioner(s).
  - Future Meetings/Agendas. At this time, the Commission may discuss and take action to set the date of a Special Meeting and/or determine those items that could be placed on the agenda of the next meeting and other future meetings of the Planning Commission.

**Commissioner Antonini:**

A couple of items, one was an article that was forwarded by Commissioner Sugaya is called "Behind the Corridor" it's thought provoking, and I think it's part of the public record; the second item that I wanted to comment on it, is from the New York Times and it is entitled "Urban Renewal No Bulldozer," and it is very worth reading, it speaks as an outsider looking at the situation in San Francisco, and it begins very positively saying, what we are doing is renovating a lot places rather than tearing them down and building something new, and it talks about all the successes that have come in the last few years, but unfortunately it then says, part of the reason for this, is our process is so involved and makes it so difficult to build anything new, and in many cases is, they did not mention renovate anything old, the only choice is to try to maintain what's there and some of the assertions, I think, are not necessarily true, but they do feel we're the NIMBY capital of America, I'm not sure if that is accurate, but they make a few statements to that, but the important thing is the conclusion that's drawn and that is that any problem we have with affordability being either commercial or residential is a result of not -- being -- caused for what we've built or by what we restored, but rather, what is not being built or what is left in disrepair and I think that -- I agree with those thoughts, that are found in this article, but it's certainly a good article to read.

**Commissioner Moore:**

I have a question for the City Attorney and for Commission Secretary, Jonas Ionin. A few weeks ago, I think it was last time we met, we had a motion in front us regarding 1433 Bush Street and the wording of the motion was void of some specifics, aside from the quantitative square footages, and also did not have the idea that the applicant, was, in a few hours of standing in front of us have agreed to have on-site approvals, when a motion is, in that sense, inaccurate, does not reflect what we are approving, how do we know that that's properly amended and incorporated?

**Jonas Ionin, Commission Secretary:**

1433 Bush, at least as far as my notes go, the action that, or the motion that was made was Approved with Conditions as Amended for staff to continue working with the sponsor, with regard to concerns raised by the Commissioners at the hearing, and there were a variety of independent concerns that were raised by Commissioners that the sponsor had agreed to look into it, if my recollection is correct.

**Commissioner Moore:**

Except that a few hours before the Commissioners, before the applicant stood in front of us, he wrote an e-mail to us, that he was considering on-site affordable, which was not part of the motion nor was it read or restated by us approving the project, we basically all said it's great, but we did not repeat it, while the motion was being made, and I'm concerned that, that might fall between the cracks.

**Jonas Ionin, Commissioner Secretary:**

If it's not part of the motion Commissioners, it's not part...

**Commissioner Wu:**

My question is whether staff read it into the record. Which, I believe they did.

**Commissioner Moore:**

I do not recall that.

**Jonas Ionin, Commissioner Secretary:**

I don't recall that either, because then the approval would have been as Amended with what staff read into the record, I could look into further for this particular case, but if it's not a part of the official record, either in the draft motion or read into the record by staff or the Commission, then it's not something that gets

officially adopted into the action or the final motion. If the sponsor, obviously, voluntarily wants to provide that, then that...

**Commissioner Moore:**

Neighborhood concerns had strongly asked that he does, we obviously were so enthusiastic in hearing that, that I think, in the idea of enthusiasm, we forgot to restate it and that can sometimes happen, you might want to listen to it, I just recall and said, how do we know that we are catching this?

**Jonas Ionin, Commission Secretary:**

Right, I think it's the responsibility of staff and the commissioners and myself at the hearing, if it's – see I wasn't even aware – I wasn't even a party of the e-mail that was sent prior to the hearing, unless it gets mentioned as part of the actual motion then it doesn't adopted into the final motion.

**Commissioner Moore:**

I will forward the e-mail to you, which came in a few hours ago, and perhaps check out what happened.

**Jonas Ionin, Commission Secretary:**

I can certainly follow-up on that.

**Commissioner Sugaya:**

I seem to remember that, staff did make a presentation that included that statement. That the project sponsor had voluntarily included on-site, and I don't remember if there was a Commission discussion about it, but I think staff did mention it, as I recall.

**D. DEPARTMENT MATTERS**

7. Director's Announcements

**Jeff Joslin, Director of Current of Planning:**

I believe you got a copy of the Director's Report in your packets, I have nothing to add to report.

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

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS:**

**LAND USE COMMITTEE:**

5/26/14

- There was no Land Use Committee on May 26th due to the Memorial Day Holiday.

**6/2/14 Hearing**

**Designation of 1007 Market Street (aka James G. Walker Building).** This item proposes to change the Article 11 designation for 1007 Market Street from a Category V (Unrated) building to a Category III (Contributory) building. The change of designation was proposed by the building owners, the Community Arts Stabilization Trust (C.A.S.T.), and will allow the owners to sell Transfer of Development rights. Planning Commission did not hear this item, but it was heard by the Historic Preservation Commission on April 2 of this year. The HPC voted unanimously to recommend the Board approve the change of designation. Supervisor Kim sponsored the item and spoke in support of the change of designation as an important tool for stabilizing arts programs in San Francisco. Members of C.A.S.T. and the consultant who prepared the

change of designation report spoke to the building's importance to the local arts community. The Land Use Committee voted to send the item to the Full Board with a positive recommendation.

#### FULL BOARD OF SUPERVISORS:

5/27/14

- There was no Board of Supervisors Hearing on May 27, 2014 due to the Memorial Day Holiday.

6/3/14

- **140062 Mayor Lee and Sup. Cohen. Planning Code changes to P Zoned Districts.** This Ordinance would amend controls in the Planning Code for P Districts in order to facilitate the new SF Plaza Program. This item was heard by the Planning Commission on May 1 of this year and was recommended unanimously for approval. This item passed its second read and was sent to the Mayor's Office for his signature.
- **Appeal 653-655 Fell Street Lot Subdivision.** This appeal was originally scheduled to be heard on May 6, 2014, but was continued so that the appellant and applicant could provide the Board with more information. At this week's hearing the appeal was withdrawn by the appellant because the two parties had come to an agreement.

#### INTRODUCTIONS (4):

- **140593 Fee Elimination Ordinance.** Mayor. Ordinance amends the Planning Code to eliminate 4 fees, including the Installment Agreement Processing Fee, the Refund Processing Fee, the Fee for Information Analysis Request for Information Technology, and the Reactivation Fee for Closed Cases. This Ordinance was initiated by the Planning Commission and was recommended for approval by the Planning Commission on May 8.
- **140659 Calle 24.** Campos. Resolution Correcting the Resolution Establishing the Calle 24 Latino Cultural District. The Resolution was amended to remove Precita Park from the cultural district. (Resolution No. 168-14 - )
- **140656 McCoppin Plaza.** Kim. Resolution declaring the intention of the Board of Supervisors to order the vacation of a portion of McCoppin Street for the purposes of the McCoppin Hub City Plaza Project. This item will come to the Commission next week as a Zoning Map Amendment.
- **140645 Transbay Community Facilities District.** Resolution of Intention - Establish Community Facilities District - Transbay Transit Center. Transit Center District Plan (adopted August 2012) authorized the formation of the Transbay CFD, including Planning Code language stating that major new development is required to join the CFD. Since then, the City and TJPA have been working to develop the materials to create the CFD, including the materials introduced on Tuesday. This item will be heard by Capital Planning Committee and the Board of Supervisors; it involves multiple board hearings and a property owner vote. JCFA's must also be adopted by TJPA and BART Boards. It is expected to be finally adopted by end of year. This item will not come before this Commission.

There were also three additional charter amendments and an Initiative Ordinance introduced in May that will be on the November 4<sup>th</sup> ballot. These items do not amend the Planning Code and will not be brought to the Planning Commission for review or action.

- **140556. Charter Amendment, Transportation Fund Adjustment.** Wiener. The Amendment would amend the Charter to adjust the required annual appropriation from the General Fund to the Transportation Fund to reflect increases in the population of San Francisco.
- **140555. Charter Amendment Rainy Day Reserve.** Avalos. The Amendment would amend the Charter to provide for a City Reserve and a School Reserve within the existing Rainy Day Reserve.
- **140554. Charter Amendment Special Elections for Vacancies.** Avalos The Amendment would require the Department of Elections to call a special election when there is a vacancy in the office of Mayor, Assessor-Recorder, City Attorney, District Attorney, Public Defender, Sheriff, Treasurer, or Member of the Board of Supervisors.
- **140509 Initiative Ordinance General Obligation Bonds –Transportation and Road Improvement - \$500,000,000.** Mayor Lee. This ordinance places a 500,000,000 bond on the November 4<sup>th</sup> ballot to finance the construction, acquisition, and improvement of certain transportation and transit related improvements.

### Addition Information

#### Transbay Transit Center Community Facilities (Mello-Roos) District

Introduced: June 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2014

#### Overview

- *Legislation introduced June 3<sup>rd</sup> to initiate process to approve the Transbay Transit Center Community Facilities (Mello-Roos) District ("Transbay CFD")*
- Packet includes:
  - Resolution of Intention to Establish CFD, including:
    - Description of Facilities
    - Rate and Method of Apportionment of Special Tax
    - Map of proposed district and future annexation area
    - Joint Community Facilities Agreements with TJPA and BART
  - Resolution to Incur Debt
- *Transit Center District Plan (adopted August 2012) authorized the formation of the Transbay CFD, including Planning Code language stating that major new development is required to join the CFD*
- *Since then, the City and TJPA have been working to develop the materials to create the CFD, including the materials introduced on Tuesday*

#### Process

- *Will be heard by Capital Planning Committee and Board*
- *Involves multiple board hearings and property owner vote*
- *JCFAs must be adopted by TJPA and BART Boards*
- *Expected to be finally adopted by end of year*

#### Applicability

- *Would apply to major new development in TCDP area, including parcels under jurisdiction of OCII*
- *Existing buildings, projects less than 9:1 FAR, and projects that received entitlements prior to the TCDP adoption are not required to join the district*
- *Initial parcels are public parcels in Zone 1 of the Transbay Redevelopment Area and project that have already received entitlements*

- Future Annexation Area includes all parcels of TCDP

#### **Rate and Method**

- *Rates and calculations are consistent with TCDP implementation document*
- Rates are based on sf/land use (residential for-sale, residential rental, retail, and office/hotel)
- Rates are set to escalate based on existing index (same as impact fees)
- Projects pay the special tax for no more than 30 years, consistent with TCDP

#### **Revenue Projections**

- *Projected to raise approx. \$85M/year at build-out, generating approx. \$1.2B in bonding capacity, which would fund approx. \$990M in public infrastructure*

#### **Expenditure Plan**

- *Pays for a comprehensive set of improvements as envisioned in the TCDP, including:*
  - o TJPA projects: DTX and portions of Transbay Terminal (City Park and Train box)
  - o Comprehensive streetscape improvements for the district
  - o New open spaces, including downtown and Chinatown improvements
- 82.6% of all revenues to TJPA projects
- *Fully funds TCDP implementation program<sup>1</sup>, in combination with impact fees, TIF, and other sources*

#### **BOARD OF APPEALS:**

##### **No Report**

#### **HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION:**

Good afternoon Commissioners, Tim Frye, Department staff, here to share with you a couple items from yesterday's Historical Preservation Commission hearing. Before the full Commission met the Architectural Review Committee provided some design guidance for the LightRail art installation. You may be familiar with the proposed installation. It's an illuminated art installation, suspended from the existing Muni lines and attached to the Path of Gold light standards running from the Embarcadero to Van Ness Avenue. The ARC, overall was supportive of the project, they did have a few issues, that they'd like the project sponsor to resolve before the full hearing, and they primarily were associated with the design of the utility boxes that would be attached to the Path of Gold light fixtures and they're overall location. The HPC will take up the request for the Certificate of Appropriateness at its June 18<sup>th</sup> hearing. The full commission then convened and provided Reviewed & Comment on the EIR for 1527 Pine Street, the Commission had very few comments, and I believe that item will be before you at a future date, if you have any questions about their comments, I am happy to forward those to you via email. And then finally, the Commission reviewed and approved a request for a Certificate of Appropriateness for Alamo Square renovations. The renovations included: improvements to the landscaping along the entries, some ADA upgrades and a new restroom structure located adjacent to the playground. Overall, the Commission was supportive of the project and the improvements. There were members of the public that came out both in support of the project, but also some members raising concern about the landscape treatment and the necessity for an additional restroom structure. At the end of the hearing the Commission voted unanimously in support of the project, and the project had been previously reviewed by the Architectural Review Committee and all comments by the ARC were incorporated into the design based on the final approval. That concludes my comments. Oh!, I am sorry, one other thing I wanted to mention to you, the HPC continues to have a discussion about preservation incentives and how they affect historic buildings in areas zoned for PDR. So the Commission has convened an informational presentation by Department staff at its next hearing on June 18<sup>th</sup>, I believe,



you'll have similar presentation on June 12<sup>th</sup> but I want to make aware, they continue to raise some of the same concerns, that this Commission does, so we'll keep you posted on their comments after the June 18<sup>th</sup> hearing. That concludes my remarks. Unless you have questions, thanks.

#### E. GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT – 15 MINUTES

At this time, members of the public may address the Commission on items of interest to the public that are within the subject matter jurisdiction of the Commission except agenda items. With respect to agenda items, your opportunity to address the Commission will be afforded when the item is reached in the meeting. Each member of the public may address the Commission for up to three minutes.

None

#### 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.

9. 2013.0154E (E. PURL: (415) 575-9028)  
MOSCONE CENTER EXPANSION PROJECT - North and South Sides of Howard Street between Third and Fourth Streets; Lot 115 in Assessor's Block 3723 and Lot 091 in Assessor's Block 3734 - **Public Hearing on the Draft Environmental Impact Report**. The proposed Moscone Center Expansion Project would increase the gross square footage of the Moscone Center convention facility by about 20 percent, from approximately 1.2 million square feet to 1.5 million square feet. New construction would be primarily above grade both north and south of Howard Street in buildings up to approximately 95 feet tall. Additional space would be created by excavating and expanding the existing below-grade exhibition halls that connect the Moscone North and South buildings. The proposed project would also reconfigure the existing below-grade loading facilities and at-grade bus pick-up and drop off facilities on Howard Street, create two pedestrian bridges spanning Howard Street, connecting Moscone North and South at the second level above grade, and include improvements to the Children's Garden south of Howard Street. The existing convention uses would continue following project completion. Both parcels on which the Moscone Center is located are within the Downtown Commercial Support District and a 340-I Height and Bulk District.

**NOTE: Written comments will be accepted at the Planning Department until 5:00 p.m. on June 16, 2014.**

Preliminary Recommendation: None – Public Hearing on DEIR

- SPEAKERS:**
- = John Elberling – Conclusive mitigation of pedestrian pathways. Wider sidewalks, mid-block signal lights. Mitigate or litigate.
  - = Sonja Kos – Pedestrian safety for seniors
  - = Alice Lake – Mitigate negative impacts
  - = Rich Smit – Balanced neighborhood, pedestrian impacts
  - + Kevin Carrol – DEIR sufficiently evaluates the impacts
  - + Jim Lazarus – DEIR accurately and adequately evaluates the project

ACTION: Reviewed and Commented

10. 2006.1308EMTZW (C. FLORES: (415) 558-6473)  
VISITACION VALLEY/SCHLAGE LOCK PROJECT - The Special Use District (SUD) is located in the southeast corner of San Francisco immediately to the north of the San Francisco / San Mateo County Line, generally bounded to the south by the City of Brisbane in San Mateo County, to the west by Bayshore Boulevard and Cora Street; to the east by Tunnel Avenue; and to the north by Blanken Avenue and Arleta Avenue (Assessor's Block/Lot No.'s AB 5066B / 003, 004, 004a, 005, 006, 007, 008, 009; AB 5087/003, 003a, 004, 005; AB 5099/014; AB 5100/ 002, 003,007,010 AB 5101/006, 007; AB 5102 / 009, 010; AB 5107/001, 003, 004, 005; AB 6233/048, 055; AB 6248/002, 045; AB 6249/001, 002, 002A, 016, 017, 018, 019, 020, 021, 022, 023, 024, 025, 026, 027, 028, 029, 030, 031, 032, 033, 034, 035, 036; AB 6308/001, 001a, 001d, 002, 002b, 003; 6309B/001, 002, 018). The project proposes to, within Zone 1 of the SUD, construct up to 1,679 new residential units, provide up to 46,700 square feet of new commercial and retail services, provide new open spaces, and new infrastructure within the development site to be built in a phases. New buildings on the site would range in height from 57 feet to 86 feet. Neighborhood-serving retail would be concentrated near the extension of Leland Avenue and close to Bayshore, along which the T-Third rail line runs. A new grocery store, new streets, infrastructure and other amenities (e.g. sustainable features, pedestrian improvements.) would also be provided on the Project Site. Infrastructure improvements would include the installation of sustainable features, such storm water management. In addition to these new parks, the Project would provide significant additional open space in the form of private or semi-private open space areas such as outdoor courtyards, roof decks, and balconies.
- 10a. 2006.1308EMTZW (C. FLORES: (415) 558-6473)  
**Request for Planning Code Text Amendments** pursuant to Planning Code Section 302 to: (1) amend Planning Code Section 249.45, the "Visitacion Special Use District" related to the Schlage Lock Development Project as described above. **Request for Planning Code Map Amendments** pursuant to Planning Code Section 302 to: (1) amend Zoning Map ZN10 to designate certain parcels in Zone 1 as Mixed Use General (MUG) zoning; and (2) amend Zoning Map HT10 to reclassify the height limits within the project site according to the proposed project, related to the Schlage Lock Development Project as described above. **Request for General Plan Amendment** pursuant to Planning Code Section 340 to amend the Urban Design Element Map 4 and Map 5; the Commerce and Industry Element Map 1, Map 2, Map 4, Map 5; the Transportation Element Map 6); and the Land Use Index to make conforming changes to facilitate the development of the project, related to the Schlage Lock Development Project as described above. The Planning Commission will consider a resolution recommending these Planning Code, Zoning Map and General Plan Amendments to the Board of Supervisors; and will also consider adopting findings, including environmental findings, Planning Code Section 302 findings, and findings of consistency with the General Plan and the priority policies of Planning Code Section 101.1. Preliminary Recommendation: Recommend approval with modifications of the Planning Code, Zoning Map and General Plan Amendments to the Board of Supervisors.

SPEAKERS: + Supervisor Cohen – Introductory comments  
 + Emily Less, OEWD – Development agreement amendments  
 + David Yudaman – Transportation Authority, Bi-County transportation study  
 + Anne Seaman – Support for Schlage Lock

- = (M) Speaker – Small business owners, negative construction impacts
  - + Russell Maureen – Support
  - = Rob Krantz – Union Pacific Railway concerns
  - + Lucky Ng – Traffic concerns, connection corridor
  - = Christian Elliot – Structural concerns
  - = (M) Speaker – Structural damages as a result of demolition
  - = Jordan Sussman – Damages due to demolition
  - + Tim Colen – Housing
  - + Chris Barrett – Good for the neighborhood
  - + Jonathan Sharpman – Response to questions
- ACTION: Adopted a Recommendation for Approval as Amended  
 AYES: Wu, Fong, Antonini, Borden, Hillis, Moore, Sugaya  
 RESOLUTION: 19163

- 10b. 2006.1308EMTZW (C. FLORES: (415) 558-6473)  
 The Project Site is located on approximately 20 acres of land in the southeast corner of San Francisco immediately to the north of the San Francisco / San Mateo County Line, generally bounded to the south by the City of Brisbane in San Mateo County, to the west by Bayshore Boulevard; to the east by Tunnel Avenue; and to the north by Blanken Avenue and Arleta Avenue (Assessor's Block/Lot No.'s 5107-001, 5087-003A, 5100-002, 5102-009, 5087-003, 5101-006, 5100-003, 5099-014, 5101-007, and 5100-010) – **Request for Approval of a Development Agreement** pursuant to Chapter 56 of the San Francisco Administrative Code between Visitacion Development, LLC. and the City and County of San Francisco, related to the Schlage Lock Development Project as described above.  
 Preliminary Recommendation: Recommend approval with modifications of the Development Agreement to the Board of Supervisors.

- SPEAKERS: + Supervisor Cohen – Introductory comments  
 + Emily Less, OEWD – Development agreement amendments  
 + David Yudaman – Transportation Authority, Bi-County transportation study  
 + Anne Seaman – Support for Schlage Lock  
 = (M) Speaker – Small business owners, negative construction impacts  
 + Russell Maureen – Support  
 = Rob Krantz – Union Pacific Railway concerns  
 + Lucky Ng – Traffic concerns, connection corridor  
 = Christian Elliot – Structural concerns  
 = (M) Speaker – Structural damages as a result of demolition  
 = Jordan Sussman – Damages due to demolition  
 + Tim Colen – Housing  
 + Chris Barrett – Good for the neighborhood  
 + Jonathan Sharpman – Response to questions
- ACTION: Adopted a Recommendation for Approval as Amended  
 AYES: Wu, Fong, Antonini, Borden, Hillis, Moore, Sugaya  
 RESOLUTION: 19164

11. 2010.0726X (D. VU: (415) 575-9120)  
2051 3<sup>RD</sup> STREET - east side between Mariposa and 18th Streets; Lots 001B, 001C, and 006 in Assessor's Block 3994 - **Request under Planning Code Section 329 for Large Project Authorization** and exceptions including rear yard per Planning Code Section 134 and open

space per Planning Code Section 135, for the proposed construction of a new six-story, 68-foot building consisting of up to 93 dwelling units including 2,165 square feet of flex space, and up to 74 off-street parking spaces. The subject property is located within the UMU (Urban Mixed Use) District and 68-X Height and Bulk District. This action constitutes the Approval Action for the project for purposes of CEQA, pursuant to Section 31.04(h) of the San Francisco Administrative Code.

Preliminary Recommendation: Approval with Conditions

- SPEAKERS:
- + Jason – Project presentation
  - + John Ennis – Project design
  - Amy Bickerton – Negative impact to southern windows. No code exceptions. Too tall
  - Victoria Zackheim – Not compatible with neighborhood character
  - Jake Rheinfrank – Incomplete plans
  - Maria Topacio – Oversized development
  - Tofer Delaney – Building heights
  - + Sonja Troun – Rental issues concentrated benefits
  - + Avi Freitas – Unpleasant rental experience
  - + Chris Nicholson – Big picture view, housing crisis
  - + Tim Colen – Integrity of the Eastern Neighborhood Plan
  - Steve Williams – Basic and inaccurate information
  - Sandy Jullio – More housing = more affordable housing
  - + Andrew Junius – Response to questions
- ACTION: Approved with Conditions
- AYES: Wu, Fong, Antonini, Borden, Hillis, Moore, Sugaya
- MOTION: 19165

12. 2013.0227C (G. CABREROS: (415) 558-6169)  
2101-2155 WEBSTER STREET - between Clay and Sacramento Streets; Lots 016, 017, 018, 021C, 034, 037, 038, 039 and 040 in Assessor's Block 0629 - **Request for Conditional Use Authorization**, pursuant to Planning Code Sections 303 and 304, for Bulk Exceptions from the "F" Bulk District and to authorize a Planned Unit Development (PUD) on a lot containing approximately 48,000 square feet, proposing 76 dwelling units by converting the existing 8-story, institutional building (formerly University of the Pacific, Arthur A. Dugoni School of Dentistry) to a 66-unit, 10-story residential building and the new construction of 10 new townhouse units at the adjacent surface parking lot fronting onto Clay and Sacramento Streets. The project site is located within a RM-1 (Residential, Mixed, Low Density) Zoning District and 160-F Height and Bulk District. This action constitutes the Approval Action for the project for purposes of CEQA, pursuant to Section 31.04(h) of the San Francisco Administrative Code.
- Preliminary Recommendation: Approve with Conditions

- SPEAKERS:
- + Kim Diamond – Project presentation
  - + Glenn Rescaldo – Project design
  - + Joseph Scott – Stimulating the economy
  - + Greg Scott – Pacific Height Residence Association support
  - + Carolyn Douglass – Looking forward to the development improvements
  - + Beverly Weincoff – Support
  - + Carania Quebel – Impressed by the sponsor and process

- + R.J. Ferrari – Local 38 Support
- + Chris Reyes – Support
- + Rudy Corpus – United Playas, remarkable relationship with Trumark
- + Tony Urbena – Support for local sheetmetal workers
- + Tim Colen – Terrific adaptive reuse
- + Peter Garza – Carpenter’s Local 22 support

ACTION: Approved with Conditions  
 AYES: Wu, Fong, Antonini, Borden, Hillis, Moore, Sugaya  
 MOTION: 19166

13. 2014.0202C (M. BOUDREAUX: (415) 575-9140)  
1525 SLOAT BOULEVARD - cross streets Clearfield and Everglade Drives; Lot 002 in Assessor’s Block 7255 - **Request for Conditional Use Authorization**, pursuant to Planning Code Sections 303 and 703.4 to establish a formula retail beauty supply store (d.b.a. Sally Beauty Supply) within the Lakeshore Plaza NC (Special Use District), a NC-S (Neighborhood Commercial, Shopping Center) Zoning District, and 26-40-X Height and Bulk District. This action constitutes the Approval Action for the project for the purposes of CEQA, pursuant to Section 31.04(h) of the San Francisco Administrative Code.  
 Preliminary Recommendation: Approve with Conditions

SPEAKERS: + Melinda Sarjapur – Project presentation  
 + (M) Speaker – 50 years anniversary for National Chain  
 ACTION: Approved with Conditions  
 AYES: Wu, Fong, Antonini, Borden, Hillis, Moore, Sugaya  
 MOTION: 19167

## H. PUBLIC COMMENT

At this time, members of the public may address the Commission on items of interest to the public that are within the subject matter jurisdiction of the Commission except agenda items. With respect to agenda items, your opportunity to address the Commission will be afforded when the item is reached in the meeting with one exception. When the agenda item has already been reviewed in a public hearing at which members of the public were allowed to testify and the Commission has closed the public hearing, your opportunity to address the Commission must be exercised during the Public Comment portion of the Calendar. Each member of the public may address the Commission for up to three minutes.

The Brown Act forbids a commission from taking action or discussing any item not appearing on the posted agenda, including those items raised at public comment. In response to public comment, the commission is limited to:

- (1) responding to statements made or questions posed by members of the public; or
- (2) requesting staff to report back on a matter at a subsequent meeting; or
- (3) directing staff to place the item on a future agenda. (Government Code Section 54954.2(a))

ADJOURNMENT – 4:29 P.M.