

## Attachment V: Minutes from the Outreach Meetings

### Discretionary Review Outreach Meeting

October 29, 2008

6:00 AM – 7:30 PM

Location: 1650 Mission Street, Room 431

Chair: Elaine Forbes

Attendees: John Rahaim, Kelley Amdur, Scott Sanchez, Lisa Chau

Sue Hestor, Anthony Chau, Jan Threlkeld, Paul Wermer, Tony Pantaleoni, Ahmad Larizadeh, Harvey Hacker, Suheil Shatara, Simon Kwan, Michael Schoolnik

Name	Organization name	Comments
Sue Hestor  Elaine Forbes	Enhood Working Group	Sue Hestor expressed that the public would like to see the Planning staff input and what provokes the filing of DR. She said that if the Department does not know what the problem really is, then there is no way to fix it. Elaine explained that one of the slides on the presentation would answer Sue's questions since we believe the improved internal review will reduce DR.
Sue Hestor	Enhood Working Group	On page 22, Proposed DR procedures, of the slide of the presentation, Sue Hestor suggested defining "construction issue" of point number four that says: "Staff returns DR applications that do not rise to a substantive planning level, i.e. views and construction issues" Sue Hestor expressed that "construction issue" is too broad and should be defined.
Sue Hestor Paul Wermer	Enhood Working Group Pacific Heights Residents Association	Sue Hestor expressed that 99% of the public do not understand the DR process and how does the Planning and DBI work. Paul Wermer agreed with Sue Hestor and said the Department should help educate the residents about the DR process. For example, a residents in his neighborhood had serious damage in his/her house due to his/her neighbor's construction. He claimed that there was no study of the project about how this construct would affect the nearby neighbors. Elaine explained this is a DBI issue and that the Planning Department could work with DBI to better educate the public about the process.
Sue Hestor	Enhood Working Group	Sue Hestor said that Supervisor McGoldrick had the Planning Department and DBI

Name	Organization name	Comments
		<p>worked on Section 311 before. She felt that the Department is missing two basic points for the DR reform:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. San Francisco has zero log lines</li> <li>2. Re-engineering process</li> </ol>
Tony Pantaleoni	Pantaleoni Architects	Tony Pantaleoni said that years ago, the Department had a building envelop guideline in three different tiers. As long as the project is built within the buildable envelope, then this project cannot be DRed by other parties. Tony Pantaleoni felt that it would be beneficial to the public since thousands of dollars were spent on DR for lawyers, packets for the Planning Commission, and redesign under the current DR process.
Sue Hestor	Enhood Working Group	Sue Hestor suggested having mandated story pole for certain type of projects during the pre-application process.
Suheil Shatara	Shatara Architecture	Suheil Sharara expressed that 40% of the projects should be approved without going to the Planning Commission hearing under the DR process. He also expressed that the pre-application meetings are useful, but some of the neighborhood groups were hard to be reached.
Ahmad Larizadeh	BANA Inc.	Ahmad Larizdeh expressed that the current DR process is driving up the price of housing in San Francisco
Sue Hestor	Enhood Working Group	Sue Hestor said that the Section 311 process came out in the end of the whole application and planners did not know that they were empowered to have the project sponsors modify the project.
Harvey Hacker	Harvey Hacker Architects	<p>Elaine answered Sue Hestor's questions by showing her the DR cases initiators' chart of the presentation; some of the DRs were filed by Planning Staff.</p> <p>Harvey Hacker agreed with Elaine and said that he rarely had projects that were approved without planners recommending changes during design review.</p>
Sue Hestor	Enhood Working Group	Sue Hestor suggested having planners go to site visit or drive-by more often to ensure consistency of plans
Scott Sanchez		Scott stated that the Department has been working with DBI with to ensure that the plans that submitted by the applicants were correct ones. Besides, planners are using new tools to verify the plans were correct.
Tony Pantaleoni	Pantaleoni Architects	Tony Pantaleoni expressed that project sponsors should be involved in RDC before the Section 311 notices were sent out. He thought that the project sponsor should be joining the RDC meeting to present and answer questions for their projects.
Harvey Hacker	Harvey Hacker Architects	Harvey Hacker said he couldn't agree more with Tony's suggestions. He felt the project sponsors should know more about the projects than everyone.

Name	Organization name	Comments
Suheil Shatara	Shatara Architecture	Suheil Shatara agreed with Tony and Harvey and said he had experience of planner misunderstood his project at the RDC level before.
Sue Hestor	Enhood Working Group	Sue Hestor suggested documenting all the RDC meeting and put them in the project dockets.
Suheil Shatara	Shatara Architecture	Suheil Shatara asked if this new DR process would address the historical issues and Category Exception issues?
Sue Hestor	Enhood Working Group	Elaine explained that the DR process does not deal with CatEX HRER issues, but that the Department has recently streamlined that process. Sue Hestor added that under the current process, there was no rules of when the CatEx should come into the picture. She felt that as long as the Section 311 is ready, CatEx should be ready to go out too.
Simon Kwan	Ko Architects	Simon Kwan asked who is eligible to file DR? Can the Department nail it in the 150 radius?
Sue Hestor	Enhood Working Group	Sue Hestor said that was illegal and she filed DR on projects that are not in her neighborhood at all.
Paul Wermer	Pacific Heights Residents Association	Paul Wermer asked if there is a list to define the Hearing officer's role? He felt a little uneasy to have just one person to replace the whole Planning Commission.
Scott Sanchez		Scott suggested having everyone write comments on what they expect and want in a hearing officer and email it back to the Planning staff.
Suheil Shantara	Enhood Working Group	Suheil added one person may get jaded in a long run.
Harvey Hecker	Harvey Hacker Architects	Harvey Hacker expressed that there were two components in the Planning Commission decision. One is the technical component and the other is the political component. He felt that when it gets to the political component, there is no difference between the current and proposed DR process.