



SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Historic Preservation Commission Resolution No. 649 Administrative Code Text Change HEARING DATE: JULY 7, 2010

1650 Mission St.
Suite 400
San Francisco,
CA 94103-2479

Reception:
415.558.6378

Fax:
415.558.6409

Planning
Information:
415.558.6377

Project Name: **Appeals of Certain Environmental Determinations and Providing Public Notice**

Case Number: 2010.0336U [Board File No. 10-0495]

Initiated by: Supervisor Alioto-Pier

Introduced: April 20, 2010

Staff Contact: AnMarie Rodgers, Manager Legislative Affairs
anmarie.rodgers@sfgov.org, 415-558-6395

Reviewed by: **Bill Wycko, Chief Environmental Review Officer**
Bill.Wycko@sfgov.org, 415-575-9048

Recommendation: **Recommend Approval with Modifications**

RECOMMENDING THAT THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS ADOPT A PROPOSED ORDINANCE WITH MODIFICATIONS THAT AMENDS ADMINISTRATIVE CODE CHAPTER 31 PROVISIONS FOR APPEALS TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF ENVIRONMENTAL DECISIONS AND DETERMINATIONS UNDER THE CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT, AND AMEND THE PROVISIONS FOR PUBLIC NOTICE OF SUCH DECISIONS AND DETERMINATIONS.

PREAMBLE

Whereas, on November 3, 2009, Supervisor Alioto-Pier introduced a proposed Ordinance under Board of Supervisors (hereinafter "Board") File Number 10-0495 which would codify procedures for appeal of neg decs and exemptions to the Board of Supervisors by amending the Administrative Code. The Ordinance would delete Section 31.16 in its entirety and add a new Section 31.16 that would set forth an appeal process for EIRs, neg decs, and exemptions (including categorical exemptions, general rule exclusions, and statutory exclusions or exemptions). The new section would establish procedures applicable to all appeals, as well as specific procedures for appeals of EIRs, neg decs, and exemptions. In addition, the legislation would amend the public notice requirements for neg decs and draft EIRs in Sections 31.11 and 31.13, such that noticing would be more limited for projects that are citywide in scope or on project sites of 5 acres or more. Furthermore, Section 31.15 would be amended to specify that final EIRs must be available to the public no less than 10 days prior to the final EIR certification hearing.; and

Whereas, on May 27, 2010, the San Francisco Planning Commission (hereinafter "PC") conducted a duly noticed public hearing at a regularly scheduled meeting to consider the proposed Ordinance; and

Whereas, the San Francisco Charter Section 4.135 states under "Other Duties" that the San Francisco Historic Preservation Commission (hereinafter "HPC") has limited jurisdiction to review and comment on certain environmental documents; specifically stating, "For proposed projects that may have an impact on historic or cultural resources, the Historic Preservation Commission shall have the authority to review and comment upon environmental documents under the California Environmental Quality Act and the National Environmental Policy Act."; and

Whereas, on June 2, 2010, the HPC conducted a duly noticed public hearing at a regularly scheduled meeting to consider the proposed Ordinance; and

Whereas, the proposed Administrative Code amendment has been determined to be categorically exempt from environmental review under the California Environmental Quality Act Section 15060(c)(2); and

Whereas, the HPC has heard and considered the testimony presented to it at the public hearing and has further considered written materials and oral testimony presented on behalf of the legislative sponsor, Department staff, and other interested parties; and

Whereas, the all pertinent documents may be found in the files of the Department, as the custodian of records, at 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco; and

Whereas, the HPC has reviewed the proposed Ordinance; and

MOVED, that the HPC hereby recommends that the Board of Supervisors recommends *approval with modification of the proposed Ordinance* and adopts the Resolution to that effect.

FINDINGS

Having reviewed the materials identified in the preamble above, and having heard all testimony and arguments, this Commission finds, concludes, and determines as follows:

1. The Planning Commission considered a similar Ordinance in 2006. At that time, the Planning Commission recommended approval with modification in Resolution Number 17335;
2. The proposed Ordinance considered by the Historic Preservation Commission today has incorporated the changes recommended by the Planning Commission in 2006;
3. The proposed Ordinance, with the modifications recommended by the Planning Department, would make Chapter 31 consistent with CEQA requirements for appeals to elected decision-making bodies;
4. The proposed amendments, with modifications, would codify existing procedures for CEQA appeals, would establish time limits for appeals, and would establish more limited notification requirements for projects of a larger scale;
5. **General Plan Compliance.** The proposed Ordinance is, on balance, consistent with the following Objectives and Policies of the General Plan:

I. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION ELEMENT

OBJECTIVE 1

ACHIEVE A PROPER BALANCE AMONG THE CONSERVATION, UTILIZATION, AND DEVELOPMENT OF SAN FRANCISCO'S NATURAL RESOURCES.

OBJECTIVE 1

EMPHASIS OF THE CHARACTERISTIC PATTERN WHICH GIVES TO THE CITY AND ITS NEIGHBORHOODS AN IMAGE, A SENSE OF PURPOSE, AND A MEANS OF ORIENTATION.

OBJECTIVE 7

ASSURE THAT THE LAND RESOURCES IN SAN FRANCISCO ARE USED IN WAYS THAT BOTH RESPECT AND PRESERVE THE NATURAL VALUES OF THE LAND AND SERVE THE BEST INTERESTS OF ALL THE CITY'S CITIZENS.

II. URBAN DESIGN ELEMENT

OBJECTIVE 1

EMPHASIS OF THE CHARACTERISTIC PATTERN WHICH GIVES TO THE CITY AND ITS NEIGHBORHOODS AN IMAGE, A SENSE OF PURPOSE, AND A MEANS OF ORIENTATION.

OBJECTIVE 2

CONSERVATION OF RESOURCES WHICH PROVIDE A SENSE OF NATURE, CONTINUITY WITH THE PAST, AND FREEDOM FROM OVERCROWDING.

6. The proposed replacement project is generally consistent with the eight General Plan priority policies set forth in Section 101.1 in that:

- A) The existing neighborhood-serving retail uses will be preserved and enhanced and future opportunities for resident employment in and ownership of such businesses will be enhanced:

The proposed Ordinance would not significantly impact existing neighborhood-serving retail uses or opportunities for employment in or ownership of such businesses.

- B) The existing housing and neighborhood character will be conserved and protected in order to preserve the cultural and economic diversity of our neighborhoods:

The proposed Ordinance with the recommended modifications, would codify existing procedures for CEQA appeals, would establish time limits for appeals, and would establish more limited notification requirements for projects of a larger scale.

- C) The City's supply of affordable housing will be preserved and enhanced:

The proposed Ordinance not affect affordable housing supply..

- D) The commuter traffic will not impede MUNI transit service or overburden our streets or neighborhood parking:

The proposed Ordinance will not result in commuter traffic impeding MUNI transit service or overburdening the streets or neighborhood parking.

- E) A diverse economic base will be maintained by protecting our industrial and service sectors from displacement due to commercial office development. And future opportunities for resident employment and ownership in these sectors will be enhanced:

The proposed Ordinance would not adversely affect the industrial or service sectors or future opportunities for resident employment or ownership in these sectors.

- F) The City will achieve the greatest possible preparedness to protect against injury and loss of life in an earthquake.

Preparedness against injury and loss of life in an earthquake is unaffected by the proposed amendments.

- G) That landmark and historic buildings will be preserved:

The proposed Ordinance will not affect landmark and historic buildings.

- H) Parks and open space and their access to sunlight and vistas will be protected from development:

The proposed Ordinance will not impact the City's parks and open space.

7. The Historic Preservation Commission therefore recommends *approval with the modifications recommended by the Planning Commission and described below:*

Recommended Modifications

1. **All Sections- Add Community Plan Exemptions.** This exemption should be added throughout the Ordinance where types of exemptions are enumerated.
2. **Section 31.16(b)(4)- Request Preparation Time.** This section provides that the "Clerk of the Board shall promptly schedule a hearing on the appeal, without regard to any rule or policy of the Board requiring a 30-day review period". This could be problematic for the Department, appellants, and project sponsors in that a hearing could be scheduled virtually immediately without any reasonable opportunity to prepare and submit written materials for the appeal hearing.
3. **Section 31.16(b)(5)- Delete Requirement for Certain Number of Copies.** This section requires that all parties submit 15 copies to the Clerk of the Board. Our experience with the number of copies provided to our Commissions is that this number is subject to change over time. The Commission recommends leaving this matter to the more malleable "Procedures of the Clerk" rather than to fixing the number through legislation.

4. **Section 31.16(b)(5)- Adjust the Response Deadline.** This section requires all parties submit all written materials no later than noon, seven days prior to the appeal hearing. The Commission would propose a staggered submission deadline that would require the appellant to submit the argument for their appeal 15 days before the hearing, the Department and project sponsor would submit responses to the argument 10 days prior to the hearing, and rebuttals by all parties are due 7 days prior to the hearing. Currently, all parties are submitting late responses and responses to late response up through the day of the appeal hearing. The Code requirement should restrain tardy responses by all parties to the greatest degree possible.
5. **Section 31.16(b)(7)- Change the Requirement for Board Action.** This section requires that the Board act within 45 days of filing the appeal. In practice, there may be some delay between the filing of an appeal and the determination that a filed appeal is a valid appeal. The Commission recommends that the 45-day deadline for Board action be counted from the date the appeal is determined to be valid.
6. **Section 31.16(b)(9)- Request Clarification on Remanded Decisions.** This section discusses reversal of the Planning Commission decision. The Commission suggests this section specify, in greater detail, the process for remanded decisions that are sent back to the Department for further work. Clarification should be added to specify whether if only the content sent back for future work can be the subject of subsequent appeals or instead if the entire CEQA work could be subject to subsequent appeal. In addition, if remanded work is subsequently appealed the Commission would suggest that all future hearings on the topic go directly to the Board of Supervisors to avoid conflicting directions to the Department. If the Board agrees with this recommendation, the Commission further recommends that the rights for an appeal of a previously remanded decision be preserved by timely comments at associated approval hearings or in writing to the ERO.
7. **Section 31.16(e)(1)- Request Clarification on Notice Types That Require Objection to Maintain Appeal Rights.** This section discusses when a potential appellant may appeal an exemption that has been “noticed”. This could be made more specific by listing the types of notice that would satisfy this requirement such as notices for 311/312, conditional use authorization, discretionary review and/or other notices of permitting.
8. **Section 31.08(f)- Request Clarifications on Notice Requirements For Exemptions.** This section provides the list of exemptions which require notice. The first clarification concerns a new exemption that would require notice: “any project for which the Planning Code or other City code or regulation requires public notice of any proposed approval action related to the proposed project.” The Commission requests clarifications on the intent of this language. The Commission is unclear if MEA could ascertain the full noticing requirements for all projects. The second clarification concerns an existing requirement for notice of demolitions. The Planning and Building Departments have different definitions for “demolition”. The Commission requests that this section apply to demolitions as defined by the Planning Code in Section 317.
9. **Section 31.08(f)- Request Clarification on the Process for Preserving Exemption Appeal Rights When No CEQA Hearing Occurs.** The last sentence this section discusses the exemption notice requirements and describes how potential appellants must raise objections as specified in order to preserve the right of appeal to the Board. The Commission believes this section needs clarification for items which have no forum for objecting; i.e. there is no CEQA hearing. In this instance, the Commission would suggest that that appellants need only to raise the issue but not

discuss or resolve the issue in order to maintain the right to appeal. Most importantly, there should not be an “on-the-spot” decision regarding the potential merits of a CEQA appeal at a discretionary review hearing.

10. **Section 31.13(d)-Request Additional Process Description.** This section discusses draft environmental impact reports (DEIR) and associated notice requirements. The section adds additional language discussing projects of large scope. This section, however, does not discuss noticing requirements for steps that occur in advance of DEIR publication such as noticing for “notice of preparation” (NOP) and “initial study” (IS). A more thorough description of the notice requirements for NOP and IS would be beneficial to the public and the Department.
 11. **Change “Approval” to “Adoption” as suggested by the City Attorney.** References to NegDec “approvals” by the Planning Commission should be changed to “adoption” throughout the proposed Ordinance to more accurately represent the action taken by the Commission.
8. In addition, the Historic Preservation Commission further recommends **that the draft Ordinance be modified to address the following points of concern:**
- 1) ensure fairness in any potential limiting of appellants to those who have been involved or commented at previous hearings and strike requirement for prior participation in categorical exemptions;
 - 2) add specificity about the role of the Historic Preservation Commission within the proposed process;
 - 3) increase notice of categorical exemptions and therefore increase capacity to secure early public involvement; and
 - 4) address the potential to limit future actions of the Historic Preservation Commission in the event of simultaneous approvals (especially potential district designation) where a CEQA appeal has been filed.

I hereby certify that the Historic Preservation Commission ADOPTED the foregoing Resolution on July 7, 2010.


Linda Avery
Commission Secretary

AYES: Buckley, Hasz, Martinez, Matsuda, and Wolfram

NAYS: --

ABSENT: Chase and Damkroger

ADOPTED: July 7, 2010