

## **Discretionary Review Outreach Meeting**

**November 19, 2008**

**6:00 AM – 7:30 PM**

**Location: 1650 Mission Street, Room 431**

**Chair: Elaine Forbes**

**Attendees: David Lindsay, Glenn Cabrerros Lisa Chau**

**Bill Sugaya, Henry Karnilowicz, Rose Hillson, Tad Sekino, Joe Acayan, Bob Noelke, Judith Hoyem, Jed lane, Martina Ehlers, Elaine Larkin, Myrta Matula, Geoff Wood, Marc Brennan, Sean Cleymaet, Patricia Vaughey, Nancy Wuerfel, Mike Satulte, Allen Gee, Dorice Murphy, Charles Ferguson, George Matula, Mary Anne Miller, Kevin Wallace, Malana Moberg, Roland Salvato, Helen Scully, Matt Williams, Brooke Sampson, Robert Scully, M.J. Gaines, Colleen Kavcrugh, Robert Colyer, Steven Williams, Jeremy Paul, Kristin Jansen, Hiroshi Fukuda**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Organization name</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Patricia Vaughey	Cow Hollow Neighborhood & Merchants	Patricia would like to know the percentage of DR cases being withdrawn and approved in 2007 as one of the charts in the presentation. Besides, she would like to know the number of projects being modified in 2007 which did not go to the BPA.
Patricia Vaughey  Elaine Forbes	Cow Hollow Neighborhood & Merchants  Planning Department	Patricia expressed that she does not get notice for pre-application meetings. Besides, some of the pre-application meetings were held in downtown offices, not within the neighborhood of subject properties. Elaine explained that the Department does not send out notice for pre-application meetings. However, it would be a good idea to establish a rule that the meeting is at or very near to the project site.
Patricia Vaughey  Elaine Forbes	Cow Hollow Neighborhood & Merchants  Planning Department	Patricia asked if the Department was going to revisit the DR reform process back in 2003. Also, she wanted to know if there was any input from the Neighborhood regarding the proposed DR process. Elaine answered that today's meeting is the fourth DR outreach meeting and we have been taking careful notes from all of the participants.
Mary Anne Miller  Elaine Forbes	SPEAK  Planning Department	Mary Anne asked when would the notification be sent out to the public during the proposed internal process. She commented that the proposed internal review process would work exactly the same as the current internal review process. Elaine said that under the proposed internal review process, notices would not be sent out until projects comply with the Residential Design Guidelines.

Name	Organization name	Comments
George Matula	Twin Peaks Improvement Association	George commented that the internal review process is one-sided between planners and project sponsors. He felt that neighborhood organizations should be involved in the RDC review process.
Elaine Forbes	Planning Department	Elaine explained that this is the processed internal review process and the Department planned to strengthen the internal project review process and keep it consistent.
Allen Gee	AGArchitects	Allen agreed with Elaine and said the internal review slide of the presentation showed how the Department was going to improve the interview review process.
Patricia Vaughey	Cow Hollow Neighborhood & Merchants	Patricia asked who appoint the RDC members? If the public does not agree with the RDC's decision, what would be the next step? Also, she felt that 30 days notice was too short. Besides, what is the qualification of the hearing officer?
Elaine Forbes	Planning Department	Elaine answered that the RDC members would be appointed by the Planning Director. The public can appeal the case if they did not agree with the Department's decision. The hearing officer could be a retired senior planner or architect, or someone skilled without conflicts or interest.
Patricia Vaughey	Cow Hollow Neighborhood & Merchants	Patricia suggested having two to three hearing officers instead of one. Or the commissioners could rotate as the hearing officer.
Jeremy Paul	OPC	Jeremy asked Commissioner Sugaya how would the proposed DR process affect the BPA?
Bill Sugaya	Planning Commissioner	Commissioner Sugaya said that under the current DR process, all DR cases are appealable. Under the proposed DR process, he would assume that number of DR cases taken to the BPA would be the same or less.
Jeremy Paul	OPC	Jeremy was concerned that under the proposed DR process, DR cases would be going to the BPA without action memos.
Elaine Forbes	Planning Department	Elaine explained that everything would be documented under the proposed DR process. The DR action memo would be replaced by the RDC decision letter.
Elaine Larkin	Cow Hollow Association	Elaine commented that the pre-application meetings were very important; they were the eyes and ears and she thought that planners should be at the pre-application meeting too. Also when plans were modified, planners should email all the parties for the updated plans and pass the information along. She felt that all the control should be done through the front end.
		An architect in the group felt that 30 days of the 311/312 notice was too short. He had a couple of pre-application meetings that nobody showed up. He felt that longer notice time can replace the pre-application meeting. Another architect in the group said that the current DR process showed the failure of

Name	Organization name	Comments
		the Planning code. The public needs a Planning code that can be applied instead of negotiation on block by block basis. Ultimately, the single family home owners get hurt under the current DR process.
Kristin Hansen	Homeowner	Kristin commented that the term, exceptional extraordinary circumstance should be defined to filter the baseless DR. Besides she felt that the proposed DR process did not say if the DR process would be compressed. For her going through a three year DR process was very painful.
Elaine Forbes	Planning Department	Elaine said the proposed DR process has not yet address the DR process time, but the department's goal was to eliminate the baseless DRs.
Rose Hillson	Jordan Park Association	Rose commented that the pre-application should be checkable and filed in the DR dockets. She found that the DR notice has no picture and one of the notices arrived to her nine days before the hearing; it left her minimal time to respond to the DR and go to the hearing. She was not sure if planners check the plans thoroughly before the Section 311 notifications were sent out. She found that notifications of projects with violations were sent out.
Patricia Vaughey	Cow Hollow Neighborhood & Merchants	Patricia said that more thorough plans should be sent out with the Section 311 notification: floor plans of each floor, rear yard, and the elevations. Moreover, accurate plans should be sent to the Planning Commission, not drawings. She also found that only a few cases follow the Residential Design Guidelines and there were inconsistency between planners.
Hiroshi Fukuda	Coalition of SF Neighborhoods	Hiroshi asked if the hearing officer would get a set of instruction for the DR hearing. Is so, he would like the instruction to go out for public review. He was concerned that the hearing officer would not compromise at all. He liked the idea of strengthening the interview review process though.
Allen Gee Elaine Forbes	AGArchitects Planning Department	Allen asked if other jurisdictions have DR process and hearing officers? Elaine answered that San Francisco is alone on our process. No other cities have DR process like San Francisco.
Martina Ehlers	Cow Hollow Association	Martina said that 99% of the reduced plans sent out with the Section 311 were different from the real plans in the dockets. She suggested everyone to go to look at the real plans in the dockets for any Section 311 notifications that he/she received.