

# SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING COMMISSION



## Meeting Minutes

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

**Thursday, August 30, 2018**  
**1:00 p.m.**  
**Regular Meeting**

**COMMISSIONERS PRESENT:** Fong, Hillis, Johnson, Koppel, Melgar, Moore, Richards

**THE MEETING WAS CALLED TO ORDER BY PRESIDENT HILLIS AT 1:06 PM**

**STAFF IN ATTENDANCE:** Audrey Butkus, David Winslow, Chris May, Mary Woods, Elizabeth Jonckheer, Jeff Horn, Scott Sanchez – Zoning Administrator, John Rahaim – 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.

1. 2017-015181CUA (A. PERRY: (415) 575-9017)  
412 BROADWAY – north side of Broadway between Montgomery and Kearny Streets, on Lot 033 in Assessor's Block 0144 (District 3) – Request for a **Conditional Use Authorization**, pursuant to Planning Code Sections 303 and 714, to permit an extension of operating hours until 4 a.m. daily, for an existing Restaurant and Nighttime Entertainment use (d.b.a. The Penthouse Club & Restaurant). No other changes are proposed. The proposed project

is located within the Broadway Neighborhood Commercial District (NCD) and 65-A-1 Height and Bulk District. The Project is not subject to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) as the extension of hours is not considered a “project” under CEQA.

*Preliminary Recommendation: Disapprove*

(Continued from Regular hearing on June 14, 2018)

**(Proposed Continuance to September 13, 2018)**

SPEAKERS: None

ACTION: Continued to September 13, 2018

AYES: Fong, Hillis, Johnson, Koppel, Melgar, Moore, Richards

2. 2016-009062DRP (N. TRAN: (415) 575-9174)  
505 GRAND VIEW AVENUE - corner of Grand View Avenue and Elizabeth Street, Lot 044 in Assessor’s Block 2828 (District 8) - Requests for **Discretionary Review** of Building Permit Application No. 2016.11.23.3441, proposing to construct three new accessory dwelling units at the ground and basement levels and interior/exterior tenant improvements and Building Permit Application No. 2016.06.30.1337 proposing to construct a fourth floor vertical addition to the existing six-unit 3-story over basement residential building with additional interior remodeling and new roof decks within a RM-1 (Residential-Mixed, 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 San Francisco Administrative Code Section [31.04\(h\)](#).  
 Staff Analysis: Full Review  
*Preliminary Recommendation: Do Not Take Discretionary Review and Approve*  
 (Continued from Regular hearing on June 7, 2018)  
**(Proposed Continuance to September 13, 2018)**

SPEAKERS: + Jennifer Feeber – Support for continuance

ACTION: Continued to September 13, 2018

AYES: Fong, Hillis, Johnson, Koppel, Melgar, Moore, Richards

3. 2017-001225DRP-02 (E. SAMONSKY: (415) 575-9112)  
701 HAMPSHIRE STREET – south east corner of the intersection of 19th and Hampshire Streets; Lot 018 in Assessor’s Block 4078 (District 8) - Request for **Discretionary Review** of Building Permit Application No. 2017.0124.7741, proposing to convert the ground floor garage space into two accessory dwelling units and construct a vertical addition (fourth floor) of approximately 1,051 square feet (vertical addition would add living space to the existing units #4 and #5 on the third floor), and interior and exterior remodel of the existing six-unit apartment building within a RH-2 (Residential, House, Two-Family) Zoning District and 40-X Height and Bulk District.  
 Staff Analysis: Abbreviated Discretionary Review  
*Preliminary Recommendation: Do Not Take Discretionary Review and Approve*  
 (Continued from Regular hearing on June 21, 2018)  
**(Proposed Continuance to October 25, 2018)**

SPEAKERS: - Jennifer Feeber – Not in support of continuance  
 + Christina Tran – Negotiations to continue

ACTION: Continued to September 6, 2018

AYES: Fong, Hillis, Johnson, Koppel, Melgar, Moore, Richards

## 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

4. [2018-004528CND](#) (M. DITO: (415) 575-9164)  
7-11 GERMANIA STREET/73-77 WEBSTER STREET – southwest corner of Germania and Webster Streets; Lot 003 in Assessor’s Block 0868 (District 5) – Request for **Condominium Conversion Subdivision** to convert a four-story, six-unit building into residential condominiums within an 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*

SPEAKERS: None  
 ACTION: Approved  
 AYES: Fong, Hillis, Johnson, Koppel, Melgar, Moore, Richards  
 MOTION: [20266](#)

- 5a. [2018-000751CUA](#) (M. CHANDLER: (415) 575-9048)  
1501 CALIFORNIA STREET – southeast corner of California Street and Larkin Street, Lot 001 in Assessor’s Block 0645 (District 3) – Request for **Conditional Use Authorization**, pursuant to Planning Code Sections 723 and 303, to establish a 695 square foot Restaurant Use (d.b.a Akiko’s Restaurant) at an existing ground floor commercial tenant space. The project proposes exterior signage, one new exterior light, an exterior exhaust vent and new rooftop mechanical equipment with screening. The site is located within the Polk Street NCD (Neighborhood Commercial) Zoning District and 65-A Height and Bulk District. This project was reviewed under the Community Business Priority Processing Program (CB3P). 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: Fong, Hillis, Johnson, Koppel, Melgar, Moore, Richards  
 MOTION: [20267](#)

- 5b. [2018-000751VAR](#) (M. CHANDLER: (415) 575-9048)  
1501 CALIFORNIA STREET – southeast corner of California Street and Larkin Street, Lot 001 in Assessor’s Block 0645 (District 3) – Request for **Variance**, pursuant to Planning Code Section 136, from the Zoning Administrator to permit the installation of one exterior exhaust vent which will project 2 feet over the sidewalk. The proposed duct will extend from the tenant space to the roof and will maintain a height of 9 feet 5 inches above grade level. The project proposes the establishment of a Restaurant Use (d.b.a Akiko’s Restaurant) within the Polk Street NCD (Neighborhood Commercial) Zoning District and

65-A Height and Bulk District. This project was reviewed under the Community Business Priority Processing Program (CB3P).

SPEAKERS: Same as item 5a.

ACTION: ZA Closed the PH and indicated an intent to Grant

## C. COMMISSION MATTERS

### 6. Commission Comments/Questions

#### **Commissioner Richards:**

It has been a very busy week. Actually, so much happened this week, I think more than happened in the break that we were out so I'm going to be very brief. There was – we've been hearing about the Tuolumne River and the PUC's fighting the State Water Resources Board to curtail shipments of water to the Bay Area and there was a point counterpoint on Tuesday in the Chronicle. "City's demand destroying state's rivers, native fisheries", Yes on the yes side, No, "California plan would force rationing throughout Bay Area". When I was reading the 807 Franklin, the negative deck in the EIR on page 120, they talked about water resources and it talked about, will adding additional residents to this project create any issues with water? And the answer in that EIR was no because we were supposed to have enough water in the future for these residents come I think through 2040 was what it was. But if you look at what is being said here under the No side, "Under this scenario, huge portions of the Bay Area would immediately face water rationing on the order of 20 to 30 percent beyond the conservation rates achieved during the recent drought. Since the Bay Area's Tuolumne River water users are already among the most frugal in California (residents use just 54 gallons per capita, per day, compared to the statewide average of 82 gallons)," that is what Todd David had mentioned when I brought this up last time. "Some communities will be forced to achieve the water-use rates unseen anywhere in the developed world." Then it went on and said, "San Francisco, is one of the cities, could all be forced to impose emergency moratoria on building everything from schools and parks to hospitals and housing." So, I think this is kind of a looming issue, I don't know with the sense of my other Commissioners is, but maybe it would be informational from the SF PUC to come and tell us about what the water situation is, and why we're going to have enough water in all of these buildings. I think it might, and I understand the methodology, might be something we could be interested in; so I got a thumbs up from Commissioner Fong and a couple of head nods so Commission President and Vice President, maybe we can schedule something.

Second thing, I had lunch this week with are a member of-- a major member -- a prominent member of the development community and this person was talking about one of our recent decisions to have a house be put back the way it was, and the fact that that LLC could potentially go bankrupt. So the question I have is, understanding that we have asked for these things to happen and these partnerships, LLCs and things, are kind of separate, like 214 States Street, 310 Montcalm. If a development entity where to go bankrupt and they couldn't do what we did, what actually happens? I mean I think that it is a good question. I would like to follow up on these ones because these are, I think, significant steps that we have taken to deter bad behavior when we really thought there was a fraudulent behavior. But, I really am concerned about following up on these and if

we kind of feel good after we made the decision and we kind of go on to the next one, and we never really understand what happens so...

**Scott Sanchez, Zoning Administrator:**

We can look into that, certainly. The Commission's decision would stand regardless of the status of the property owner, and if they have bankrupted themselves or not, the Commission's decision would stand. If the Commission's decision is not implemented then we would have the ability to pursue enforcement on the ownership entity.

**Commissioner Richards:**

Okay. Perfect, perfect. I had lunch with the Director this week and I look forward to kind of the action items update once a quarter. We talked about that and we actually had some really good dialogue around that. I always tell the Department that they are their own worst marketing enemy because they are doing so much stuff that we the Commission sometimes the public don't realize, so I look forward to that. We had Ms. Clark's comments last week on the cost of community engagement. I know she was maybe being a bit cynical, however, you know, we are looking at the Housing Affordability Study. This week we had condos stalled out as a "Builder's cash out", front page of the Chronicle. Today, "Construction firms facing worker gap" even if they have the money, they don't have the workers; New York Times, "How tariffs could make apartments more expensive." So there is this overwhelming amount of "Hey, costs are going up, and etc.", so I had a discussion with the Director as well during our lunch. I'd really love to understand the time in the Housing Affordability Study, the timelines and the costs and what happens at the same time? So we are being led to believe, community process takes a lot of time and money, but and it happens, kind of in isolation or sequence. When maybe they're trying to get a permit for this or that, and all these things are happening concurrently. I really want to understand kind of how this all fits together. I think the take away in the article was, if the investors don't achieve six percent return, stuff is not getting built. I would love to see what all those nickels and dimes add up to you and why things aren't getting built as part of the Housing Affordability Study. Lastly, very briefly, I saw in the Chronicle this week as well, there's been a Central SoMa Economic Report put out by City Economist, Ted Egan. It may have come out after we voted on the Central SoMa Plan but I look forward to having Mr. Egan come and tell us the impacts of the Central SoMa Plan and hopefully he can bring copies with him or send us it in advance and we can follow it. Thank you.

**Vice-President Melgar:**

To piggyback on the Central SoMa Plan and the study that was done by Ted Egan, we added some language and that what came out of this Commission on Good Jobs. It is the first time that I have seen that happen and it occurs to me that every project that we get has prevailing wages and stuff around local hiring. But I don't know what the cumulative impact is of that. I've never seen like an analysis or a report on how we are doing. I feel like the information that we get with every project is not consistent. Sometimes it is there and sometimes it is not. So I would be really interested when we have Mr. Egan come, to have someone from Economic and Workforce Development, specifically the local hiring folks, come and tell us about Central SoMa specifically. Like, what we are thinking is going to happen, given this language and whether or not this is language that we need to incorporate in other areas that are being developed, if it makes a difference. I'm really interested in that. And then the other issue that I wanted to talk about and follow up with staff is about Family Housing. Remember Family Housing? We had, Sue Exline and Sheila

Nickolopoulos and folks, do some really great work. And I'm not sure where that is but at the very least, I have heard that term used by a lot of folks, meaning different things. And I think before we can do anything progressive, especially in talking about developing higher density on the west side and stuff, I think we need a definition of what Family Housing is. And I think it is going to take more than even just the Planning Department coming up. It sounds like we mean something, just two bedrooms, right? But it's something, it's actually all sorts of different things that we should be thoughtful about. It could be the start of some good stuff. So I would request respectfully that we follow up on that conversation and perhaps get it going, you know, the sure definition. Thank you.

**Commissioner Moore:**

Commissioners Melgar and Richards, I am assuming that the question you are asking regarding Central SoMa Plan include the Central SoMa version that we have not quite heard yet.

**Commissioner Richards:**

Correct.

**Commissioner Moore:**

Thank you. Just for clarifying that. I have a question for Zoning Administrator Sanchez. I am glad you are here today. In yesterday's paper, I read that Senator Weiner is introducing the statewide new version on how long bars can stay open, until 4:00 am in the morning. How does that affect you relative to specific neighborhood located bars etc.? I'd be curious to see the impact on San Francisco.

**Scott Sanchez, Zoning Administrator:**

My understanding, local land use controls would still apply. The Neighborhood Commercial Districts, most of them will have limits on hours of operation to either, 10:00 pm, 12:00 am or 2:00 am. Probably where we would see most difference would be in the districts that don't have limits on hours of operation, such as the C-3 Zoning District, where there's generally no limits on hours. Right now under the Planning Code, this would allow those bars to stay open beyond 2:00 am.

**Commissioner Moore:**

Thank you for clarifying that. I'm raising the question because the paper was very generic about their answer. So I felt it was an ability to really let the neighborhood people know that this will not immediately affect neighborhoods and protected hours that are already established. Thank you so much for clarifying.

**Commissioner Richards:**

I appreciate you, Commissioner Moore, for bringing that up. I did a double take, I did read the same article in the Chronicle and Senator Wiener was saying these hours of operation is a Land Use category on the Zoning table and the quote was "one size state mandates do not fit all localities". It kind of made me scratch my head in light of some of the things that he was proposing recently. So anyways, I just wanted to mention that.

**President Hillis:**

And also, Commissioner Melgar and I and Director Rahaim were at the Mayor's announcement where Mayor Breed announced an effort to expedite the construction of

ADUs. There's a fairly sizable backlog. I think we all agree and we have seen their efficient way to add new units to the existing. I mean, they are generally in spaces that are unoccupied and so it is a good way to add new units. But I think the city's process has not necessarily caught up with how to do these. They are generally in ground-floor levels with exiting issues. So Mayor Breed issued a directive to try to get these done and departments working together to get them done in a timely fashion, which is exciting to see. I don't know if you want to add anything to that.

**John Rahaim, Planning Director:**

Yes, thank you Commissioner, I was going to mention that as well. The Mayor did have a press conference today. We had been working with the Fire Department and Department of Building Inspection to streamline our process. I just want to first give a big shout out to Marcelle Boudreaux and the staff who really worked hard to make all this happen because we have come up with a much more streamlined solution to how these work. We have set up actually on the fifth floor of DBI, a desk solely for ADUs. There is a backlog of 900 units right now that we have in applications for. We have approved 377 I think was a number put out today. Interestingly enough, during the press conference, I learned what two residents came in and applied for ADU permits, just coincidentally, which was kind of interesting. But the goal is to have all departments finish their work within four months, to issue permits within four months and to clear the backlog in six months. And Marcelle feels confident that with the new procedures that we can make that happen. I am really grateful to her for her work and for the Mayor for – I think part of the reason for the backlog is that we have way more applications than we ever imagined. We are getting applications at the rate of about 500 a year. It is a very substantial program right now.

**President Hillis:**

It would be great if we can get a report, whatever you will eventually do for the Mayor's office to track where we are with the backlog.

**Commissioner Moore:**

I think this Commission is very supportive and interested in ADUs. I hope that Ms. Boudreaux sometimes could present to us of what the biggest hurdles are for her to look at certain units. There are others I read in the paper that the interpretation of Fire Code, for example, is often a hindrance and comes past the fact. Those are kind of subtle issues that need to be considered. I am very kind of tuned into the comment of Ms. Feeber this morning, a few minutes ago, that it is the impact on tenants that is a very important issue that we need to be concerned about because we cannot afford to gain one and lose five. The subject has not brought up very often, but I think, I hope that Ms. Boudreaux will also be able to inform us about that issue.

**Commissioner Richards:**

Last comment - I know when we did the budget we hid, earmarked, some funding or an FTE for the people or the tenants and I look forward, in the coming quarters, understanding how that plays out.

**John Rahaim, Planning Director:**

You approved the budget that had an ADU position in it and that is in the process of being hired. The other position that you had requested did not make the Mayor's Office budget, Mayor's budget. So we are looking at other ways of making that work happen.

**Commissioner Richards:**  
Great thanks.

#### D. DEPARTMENT MATTERS

7. Director's Announcements

**John Rahaim, Planning Director:**  
That was my announcement. Thank you Commissioner.

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

**Aaron Starr:**  
The Board resumes next week so I'll have a report for you then. Thank you.

**Scott Sanchez, Zoning Administrator:**  
The Board of Appeals did not meet last night or the week before. They are back in action on September 12 when they'll be hearing the rehearing for the removal of the Early Day's Statue from the Pioneer Monument.

#### E. GENERAL 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. Each member of the public may address the Commission for up to three minutes.

**SPEAKERS:** Georgia Schuttish – 90 Woodland Avenue, 2942 Webster  
Ozzie Rohm – Permit issuance, rental registry  
Jerry Graveler – 214 States, LLC bankruptcy  
Laura Clark – ADU announcement, Housing Accountability Act

#### 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. [2018-008654GPA](#) (A. BUTKUS: (415) 575-9129)  
DOWNTOWN AREA PLAN AMENDMENT FOR 175 GOLDEN GATE AVENUE– Initiation of a **General Plan Amendment** to amend the San Francisco General Plan to revise Map 1 of the Downtown Area Plan to include 175 Golden Gate Avenue, Assessor's Block No. 0349, Lot No. 011 in the C-3-G, Downtown General area; and making environmental findings, findings of consistency with the General Plan and the Priority Policies of Planning Code

Section 101.1, and findings of public necessity, convenience and welfare under Planning Code, Section 340.

*Preliminary Recommendation: Initiate*

(Continued from Regular hearing on August 23, 2018)

SPEAKERS: = Audrey Butkus – Staff report

ACTION: Initiated and Scheduled a hearing on or after September 27, 2018

AYES: Fong, Hillis, Johnson, Koppel, Melgar, Moore, Richards

RESOLUTION: [20268](#)

10. [2018-005411CRV](#) (C. MAY: (415) 575-9087)

**RESIDENTIAL ROOF DECKS POLICY – Informational Presentation** - In response to an increasing number of requests for the Discretionary Review of small-scale residential projects involving roof decks and accompanying stair and elevator penthouses, the Planning Commission directed Planning staff to study and develop an internal policy to ensure a consistent and predictable approach to evaluating the appropriateness of these rooftop features. This report presents the results of the Department’s research and provides suggestions for potential internal review policies with regards to residential roof decks and their associated rooftop appurtenances.

*Preliminary Recommendation: None - Informational*

SPEAKERS: = David Winslow – Staff presentation

= Chris May – Roof Decks policy

= Georgia Schuttish – Roof deck policy

= Speaker – Roof top appliances, smaller home discrimination

Rose Hillson – Decks be open-to-the-sky vs. having appurtenances / features that prevent emphasizing nature of open space. Design features as primary means to mitigate sightline, noise, light intrusions. Use living materials as ancillary to architectural / design materials. Implement state law requirements to support alternative power sources for existing & new buildings. Prioritize with less obtrusive means – roof hatches, internal stairwells. Last resort = stair or elevator penthouse (max 1) minimally-sized, not-visible-from-street or adjacent properties. Penthouses – minimal impacts on neighbors’ light access, air & visual clutter. Occupants farther away than only “adjacent” residents are affected because the roof decks are located up high & affect those \*beyond\* next door neighbors. CSFN requests checklist/matrix for review to determine compliance re issues in our letter. Notifications to occupants having a line of sight to the deck that could intrude upon the occupants’ privacy. 10-day notice insufficient with OTC roof deck permits.

= Theresa Flandrick – Airbnb

+Maurice Franco – Request that the Commission incorporate three areas into the policy:

A. Re incorporate the following paragraphs from the Draft:

1. Greening

2. Appliances

3. Lighting

4. Screening

B. Re incorporate the 5 feet setback to the rear wall of the building.

C. The emphasis on reducing Penthouse staircases needs to be more drastic. This single design element is the one that has the most disruptive effect on the overall roofline of a particular street. Remember that this element is big, not transparent and usually sticks up to 10 to 12 foot above the roofline. External staircases or hatches should be the ONLY allowed sources of access. This may require revising the Building code, which is not keeping up with the changing San Francisco urban landscape.

= Ross Levy – AIA involvement

= Chris Bigelow – Quality of life issues, notification issues

= Mitch Laplante – More data

= Patricia Heldman – Noise and light pollution

= Ozzie Rohm – Great step in the right direction; expansion of roof decks into the rear yard, pop-outs

= Pat Buscovich – Negative impact to neighbors and the neighborhood; reciprocal privacy

= Lizbeth Gordon – Consistency between existing and new homes and additions

+ Antonio – Ventilation in buildings with roof decks

= Peter Temple – Invasion of privacy, light and shadow.

ACTION: None - Informational

- 11a. [2013.1224SHD](#) (M. WOODS: (415) 558-6315)  
807 FRANKLIN STREET – west side between Turk and Eddy Streets, Lot 002 in Assessor's Block 0744 (District 5) - Request for Adoption of **Shadow Findings**, pursuant to Planning Code Section 295 regarding a Shadow Study that concluded that the net new shadow cast by the construction of an eight-story, 80-foot tall residential building over one-story of parking, containing 48 dwelling units, 17 stacked parking spaces, and 80 bicycle parking spaces, would not be adverse to the use of Jefferson Square Park, land under the jurisdiction of the San Francisco Recreation and Park Department. The project site is located within a RM-4 (Residential-Mixed, High Density) Zoning District and 80-B Height and Bulk District.

*Preliminary Recommendation: Adopt Findings*

SPEAKERS: = Mary Woods – Staff report

+ Toby Morris – Project presentation

+ Jim Worshell – Preservation

= Marlene Morgan – Better project

+ Pastor Ray Scott – Person not just the project

= Jerry Drapler – Tim Brown reality

+ John Kevlin – Response to question

ACTION: Adopted Findings

AYES: Fong, Hillis, Johnson, Koppel, Melgar, Moore, Richards

MOTION: [20269](#)

- 11b. [2013.1224CUA](#) (M. WOODS: (415) 558-6315)  
807 FRANKLIN STREET – west side between Turk and Eddy Streets, Lot 002 in Assessor's Block 0744 (District 5) - Request for **Conditional Use Authorization**, pursuant to Planning Code Sections 253, 271 and 303, to relocate a vacant two-story over basement, single-

family Victorian home from 807 Franklin Street to 635 Fulton Street, and construct an eight-story residential building over one-story of parking, containing 48 dwelling units, 17 stacked parking spaces, and 80 bicycle parking spaces, totaling approximately 63,000 square feet. The proposal is seeking Conditional Use authorization for height above 50 feet, street frontage greater than 50 feet, and a bulk exception. The project site is located within a RM-4 (Residential-Mixed, High Density) Zoning District and 80-B 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 11a.

ACTION: Approved with Conditions as Amended by Staff, including the proposed material palette.

AYES: Fong, Hillis, Johnson, Koppel, Melgar, Moore, Richards

MOTION: [20270](#)

- 12a. [2017-007542CUA](#) (M. WOODS: (415) 558-6315)  
[635 FULTON STREET](#) – south side between Laguna and Webster Streets, Lot 027 in Assessor’s Block 0795 (District 5) - Request for **Conditional Use Authorization**, pursuant to Planning Code Sections 253 and 303, to move the existing three-story mixed use building, containing a mortuary and two dwelling units, approximately 14 feet to the eastern edge of the project site, relocate the vacant two-story over basement, single-family Victorian home from 807 Franklin Street to the west side of the mortuary/residential building, construct one-story vertical additions and horizontal rear additions to both buildings, convert the mortuary use to residential use, and reconfigure both buildings to add 14 new dwelling units, resulting in a total of 17 dwelling units and no vehicle parking. The proposal is also seeking a Variance to the rear yard setback requirement (Section 134). The project site is located within a RM-2 (Residential-Mixed, Moderate Density) Zoning District and 50-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 11a.

ACTION: Approved with Conditions as Amended by Staff, including the proposed material palette.

AYES: Fong, Hillis, Johnson, Koppel, Melgar, Moore, Richards

MOTION: [20271](#)

- 12b. [2017-007542VAR](#) (M. WOODS: (415) 558-6315)  
[635 FULTON STREET](#) – south side between Laguna and Webster Streets, Lot 027 in Assessor’s Block 0795 (District 5) - Request for a **Variance** from the rear yard setback requirement (Planning Code Section 134). The proposed project is to renovate and expand two buildings, containing three dwelling units, and to add 14 new dwelling units, resulting in a total of 17 dwelling units. The project site is located within a RM-2 (Residential-Mixed, Moderate Density) Zoning District and 50-X Height and Bulk District.

SPEAKERS: Same as item 11a.

ACTION: ZA Closed the PH 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.

14. [2017-007888DRP](#) (L. AJELLO: (415) 575-9142)  
2742 BUCHANAN STREET – east side of Buchanan Street between Vallejo Street and Broadway; Lot 049 in Assessor’s Block 0566 (District 2) – Request for **Discretionary Review** of Building Permit Application No. 2017.03.06.0781 proposing a 68 square foot addition gained by infill of a 3.5 foot wide by 19.5 feet deep notch at the rear of the building along the south side property line, widening the existing second floor roof deck, and adding a spiral stair to a new roof deck on the third floor to a three-story two-family house within a RH-2 (Residential House, Two-Family) 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\(h\)](#).  
 Staff Analysis: Abbreviated Discretionary Review  
*Preliminary Recommendation: Do Not Take Discretionary Review and Approve*

SPEAKERS: = Elizabeth Jonckheer – Staff report  
 - Michael Harden – DR presentation  
 - Steve Hammond – DR presentation  
 - Pat Buscovich – DR presentation  
 + Warner Barry – Project presentation  
 + Saber Ballon – Project presentation

ACTION: No DR  
 AYES: Fong, Hillis, Johnson, Koppel, Moore, Richards  
 ABSENT: Melgar  
 DRA: [0605](#)

13. [2017-014841CUA](#) (J. HORN: (415) 575-6925)  
655 ALVARADO STREET – south side of Alvarado Street between Diamond and Castro Streets, Lot 028C in Assessor’s Block 2803 (District 8) – Request for **Conditional Use Authorization** pursuant to Planning Code Sections 303 and 317, to legalize the tantamount to demolition of an existing 2,737 square foot, two-story-over-basement single-family home and the permit a new three-story-over-two-basement-levels single-family home. The project site is located 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\(h\)](#).  
 (Continued from Regular hearing on July 26, 2018)  
*Preliminary Recommendation: Approve with Modifications and Conditions*  
**NOTE: On February 22, 2018, after hearing and closing public comment, continued to April 19, 2018 by a vote of +5 -0 (Fong absent).**  
**On April 19, 2018, without hearing, continued to May 24, 2018 by a vote of +5 -1 (Richards against; Melgar absent).**

On May 24, 2018, without hearing, continued to July 26, 2018 by a vote of +6 -0 (Richards absent).

On July 26, 2018, without hearing, continued to August 30, 2018 by a vote of +6 -0 (Hillis absent).

SPEAKERS: = Jeff Horn – Staff report  
= Patrick O’Riordan – DBI report  
+ Zack Madre – Project presentation  
- Mary Farretti – Opposition  
- Speaker – Opposition  
- Jerry Drettler – Opposition  
- Ozzie Rohm – Opposition  
- Jim Warshell – Opposition  
- Pat Buscovich – Opposition  
- Georgia Schuttish – Opposition  
- Myra – Opposition

ACTION: Approved with Conditions as Amended:  
1. For the replacement structure to be constructed with the exact massing of the previously legal building;  
2. For a Certificate of Final Completion and Occupancy be issued; and  
3. For staff to provide the CPC with an update memo and plans.

AYES: Fong, Hillis, Johnson, Koppel, Moore, Richards

ABSENT: Melgar

MOTION: [20272](#)

ADJOURNMENT – 5:08 PM  
ADOPTED SEPTEMBER 13, 2018