



# SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

---

## Executive Summary Conditional Use Authorization

HEARING DATE: NOVEMBER 7, 2013  
(CONTINUED FROM THE SEPTEMBER 19<sup>TH</sup>, OCTOBER 5<sup>TH</sup>, AND OCTOBER 17<sup>TH</sup> HEARINGS)

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

Reception:  
**415.558.6378**

Fax:  
**415.558.6409**

Planning  
Information:  
**415.558.6377**

*Date:* October 31, 2013  
*Case No.:* **2011.0544C**  
*Project Address:* **1700 Union Street**  
*Current Zoning:* Union Street Neighborhood Commercial  
40-X Height and Bulk District  
*Block/Lot:* 0529/002A  
*Project Sponsor:* AT&T Mobility represented by  
Tedi Vriheas  
855 Folsom Street, Suite 106  
San Francisco, CA 94107  
*Staff Contact:* Omar Masry – (415) 575-9116  
Omar.Masry@sfgov.org

### BACKGROUND

On September 19, 2013, the Planning Commission heard a request by AT&T Mobility for Conditional Use authorization to establish a macro Wireless Telecommunication Services (WTS) Facility at the subject property. In order for the project to proceed, the Commission had to grant Conditional Use authorization to allow the establishment of a WTS facility within the Union Street Neighborhood Commercial District, pursuant to Planning Code Sections 725.83 and 303.

At the Planning Commission hearing, and after hearing public comment, the Planning Commission continued the matter to October 3<sup>rd</sup> with direction to improve the project's design. On October 3<sup>rd</sup> at the request of AT&T Mobility, the matter was continued to October 17<sup>th</sup>. On October 17<sup>th</sup> the Planning Commission continued the matter to November 7<sup>th</sup> and adopted a motion of intent to disapprove.

### CURRENT PROPOSAL

The attached draft motion is to disapprove the request by AT&T Mobility for Conditional Use Authorization to establish a macro WTS facility at the subject property.

### REQUIRED COMMISSION ACTION

In order for the project to be denied, the Commission must adopt the attached disapproval motion.

## **BASIS FOR RECOMMENDATION OF DISAPPROVAL**

- The project is not consistent with the Wireless Guidelines and is not necessary and desirable as it:
  - Would conflict with the design of the Project site and existing neighborhood character.
  - Would create a negative impact on the aesthetic of the potential historic resource by failing to stealth and/or incorporate it into an existing feature.
  - Would result in additions to the building that would appear incongruous with the building's design.
  - Would result in the use of rooftop elements that would appear out of scale with the building and appear prominently visible from various public vistas and streets, such as Gough and Union streets.

RECOMMENDATION: Disapproval

### **Attachments:**

Disapproval Motion



# SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

2Subject to: (Select only if applicable)

- Affordable Housing (Sec. 415)
- Jobs Housing Linkage Program (Sec. 413)
- Downtown Park Fee (Sec. 412)
- First Source Hiring (Admin. Code)
- Child Care Requirement (Sec. 414)
- Other

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

Reception:  
**415.558.6378**

Fax:  
**415.558.6409**

Planning  
Information:  
**415.558.6377**

## Planning Commission Motion No. XXXXX

HEARING DATE: NOVEMBER 7, 2013

(CONTINUED FROM THE SEPTEMBER 19<sup>TH</sup>, OCTOBER 5<sup>TH</sup>, AND OCTOBER 17<sup>TH</sup>  
HEARINGS)

*Date:* October 31, 2013  
*Case No.:* **2011.0544C**  
*Project Address:* **1700 Union Street**  
*Current Zoning:* Union Street Neighborhood Commercial  
 40-X Height and Bulk District  
*Block/Lot:* 0529/002A  
*Project Sponsor:* AT&T Mobility represented by  
 Tedi Vriheas  
 855 Folsom Street, Suite 106  
 San Francisco, CA 94107  
*Staff Contact:* Omar Masry – (415) 575-9116  
 Omar.Masry@sfgov.org

**ADOPTING FINDINGS RELATING TO THE DISAPPROVAL OF A CONDITIONAL USE AUTHORIZATION UNDER PLANNING CODE SECTION 303(c) AND 725.83 TO INSTALL A WIRELESS TELECOMMUNICATIONS SERVICES FACILITY CONSISTING OF THREE SCREENED PANEL ANTENNAS LOCATED ON THE ROOF AND FAÇADE AND RELATED ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT LOCATED AT GRADE AT THE REAR OF THE PROPERTY AT AN EXISTING COMMERCIAL BUILDING AS PART OF AT&T MOBILITY’S WIRELESS TELECOMMUNICATIONS NETWORK WITHIN THE UNION STREET NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL ZONING DISTRICT, AND 40-X HEIGHT AND BULK DISTRICT.**

### PREAMBLE

On May 24, 2011, AT&T Mobility (hereinafter "Project Sponsor"), submitted an application (hereinafter "Application"), for Conditional Use Authorization on the property at 1700 Union Street, Lot 002A in Assessor's Block 0529, (hereinafter "Project Site") to install a wireless telecommunications service facility consisting of three (3) screened panel antennas located on the roof and façade of the subject building, and related electronic equipment located on the roof and at grade level in the rear of the building, as part of AT&T Mobility’s telecommunications network, within the Union Street Neighborhood Commercial Zoning District, and 40-X Height and Bulk District.

The Project is typically considered exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA") as a Class 3 Categorical Exemption (Section 15303 of the California Environmental Quality Act). The Planning Commission has reviewed and concurs with said determination. The categorical exemption and all pertinent documents may be found in the files of the Planning Department (hereinafter "Department"), as the custodian of records, at 1650 Mission Street, San Francisco.

On September 19, 2013, the San Francisco Planning Commission (hereinafter "Commission") conducted a duly noticed public hearing at a regularly scheduled meeting on the application for a Conditional Use authorization. At the Planning Commission hearing, and after hearing public comment, the Planning Commission continued the matter to October 3<sup>rd</sup> with direction to improve the project's design.

On October 3<sup>rd</sup> at the request of AT&T Mobility, the matter was continued to October 17<sup>th</sup>.

On October 17<sup>th</sup> the Planning Commission continued the matter to November 7<sup>th</sup> and adopted a motion of intent to disapprove.

The Commission 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 Applicant, Department Staff, and other interested parties.

**MOVED**, that the Commission hereby disapproves the Conditional Use in Application No. 2011.0544C, subject to the conditions contained in "EXHIBIT A" of this motion, based on the following findings:

## **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 above recitals are accurate and constitute findings of this Commission.
2. **Site Description and Present Use.** The subject building is located on Assessor's Block 0529, Lot 002A at the northwest corner of Union and Gough Streets. This site is within the Union Street Neighborhood Commercial Zoning District, and 40-X Height and Bulk District. The Project Site contains a three-story, approximately 40-foot tall, commercial building.
3. **Surrounding Properties and Neighborhood.** The subject building is located along the Union Street neighborhood commercial corridor within the Marina Neighborhood. The Project Site is located at an intersection featuring similar three-story commercial and mixed-use buildings to the west and east, a single-family neighborhood to the north, and Allyn Park to the south.

An existing micro WTS facility (dual omni “whip” antennas), operated by AT&T Mobility, is located approximately 500 feet away at 1800 Union Street. Though not a part of this project, the Project Sponsor intended to remove the micro WTS facility in the event the macro WTS facility was approved and constructed at the Project Site.

4. **Project Description.** The proposal is to install a macro wireless telecommunication services (“WTS”) facility consisting of up to three (3) panel antennas, and electronic equipment at ground level, of the subject building, as part of AT&T Mobility’s telecommunications network. Based on the zoning and land use, the antennas are proposed on a Location Preference 6 Site (Limited Preference, Individual Neighborhood Commercial District) according to the WTS Siting Guidelines.

The proposed antennas would be located in three sectors on the roof and facade of the 40-foot tall building. The first antenna would consist of a single panel antenna mounted to the north facing façade (Sector A). The antenna would be housed within a radio frequency transparent enclosure that would serve to screen the antenna, cabling and mounting bracket from view. The enclosure would be painted to match the building. Two sectors (B & C) would feature two roof-mounted antennas housed within individual faux vent pipes, mounted at a maximum height of approximately 6 feet above the roof. The actual antennas would measure approximately 72” high by 12” wide by 6” thick.

The facility would also feature electronic equipment necessary to run the facility on the roof and at a ground level location at the rear of the building. A relocated location, from the rooftop, for one equipment cabinet, is shown on an Exhibit (“B”) dated September 19, 2013.

5. **Past History and Actions.** The Planning Commission adopted the Wireless Telecommunications Services (WTS) Facilities Siting Guidelines (“Guidelines”) for the installation of wireless telecommunications facilities in 1996. These Guidelines set forth the land use policies and practices that guide the installation and approval of wireless facilities throughout San Francisco. A large portion of the Guidelines was dedicated to establishing location preferences for these installations. The Board of Supervisors, in Resolution No. 635-96, provided input as to where wireless facilities should be located within San Francisco. The Guidelines were updated by the Commission in 2003 and again in 2012, requiring community outreach, notification, and detailed information about the facilities to be installed.

Section 8.1 of the Guidelines outlines Location Preferences for wireless facilities. There are five primary areas where the installation of wireless facilities should be located:

1. Publicly-used Structures: such facilities as fire stations, utility structures, community facilities, and other public structures;
2. Co-Location Site: encourages installation of facilities on buildings that already have wireless installations;

3. Industrial or Commercial Structures: buildings such as warehouses, factories, garages, service stations;
4. Industrial or Commercial Structures: buildings such as supermarkets, retail stores, banks; and
5. Mixed Use Buildings in High Density Districts: buildings such as housing above commercial or other non-residential space.

Section 8.1 of the WTS Siting Guidelines further stipulates that the Planning Commission will not approve WTS applications for Preference 5 or below Location Sites unless the application describes (a) what publicly-used building, co-location site or other Preferred Location Sites are located within the geographic service area; (b) what good faith efforts and measures were taken to secure these more Preferred Locations, (c) explains why such efforts were unsuccessful; and (d) demonstrates that the location for the site is essential to meet demands in the geographic service area and the Applicant's citywide networks.

Before the Planning Commission can review an application to install a wireless facility, the Project Sponsor must submit a five-year facilities plan, which must be updated biannually, an emissions report and approval by the Department of Public Health, Section 106 Declaration of Intent, an independent evaluation verifying coverage and capacity, a submittal checklist and details about the facilities to be installed.

Under Section 704(B)(iv) of the 1996 Federal Telecommunications Act, local jurisdictions cannot deny wireless facilities based on Radio Frequency (RF) radiation emissions so long as such facilities comply with the FCC's regulations concerning such emissions.

6. **Location Preference.** The *WTS Facilities Siting Guidelines* identify different types of zoning districts and building uses for the siting of wireless telecommunications facilities. Under the *Guidelines*, and based on the zoning and land use, the antennas are proposed on a Location Preference 6 Site (Limited Preference, Individual Neighborhood Commercial District) according to the WTS Siting Guidelines.

The Project Sponsor submitted an Alternative Site Analysis, which was evaluated by staff, and described the lack of available and feasible sites considered a Preferred Location (Preference 1 through 5) Site. This disapproval does not preclude the carrier from re-evaluating those sites previously studied or considering Disfavored Location sites that may offer more appropriate siting scale and aesthetic advantages.

7. **Radio Waves Range.** The Project Sponsor has stated that the proposed wireless facility is necessary to address coverage and capacity gaps, as the existing AT&T Mobility micro-facility (dual omni "whip" roof-mounted antennas approximately 500 feet away at 1800 Union Street) is not able to provide sufficient coverage for voice services or meet network demands for 4G LTE data services. The network would operate in the 700 – 2,170 Megahertz (MHZ) bands, which are regulated by the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) and must comply with the FCC-adopted health and safety standards for electromagnetic radiation and radio frequency radiation.

8. **Radiofrequency (RF) Emissions:** The Project Sponsor retained Hammett & Edison, Inc., a radio engineering consulting firm, to prepare a report describing the expected RF emissions from the proposed facility. Pursuant to the *Guidelines*, the Department of Public Health reviewed the report and determined that the proposed facility would comply with the standards set forth in the Guidelines.
9. **Department of Public Health Review and Approval.** The proposed project was referred to the Department of Public Health (DPH) for emissions exposure analysis. Existing RF levels at ground level were around 1% of the FCC public exposure limit. There are no antennas at the project site.

AT&T Mobility proposes to install three (3) panel antennas at the Project Site. The antennas will be mounted at heights of approximately 38 and 45 feet above the ground. The estimated ambient RF field from the proposed AT&T Mobility transmitters at ground level is calculated to be 0.027 mW/sq. cm., which is 3.7% of the FCC public exposure limit. The three dimensional perimeter of RF levels equal to the public exposure limit extends 56 feet and does not reach any publicly accessible areas. Warning signs must be posted at the antennas and roof access points in English, Spanish, and Chinese. Workers should not have access to the area (13 feet) directly in front of the antenna while it is in operation.

10. **Coverage and Capacity Verification.** The maps, data, and conclusion provided by AT&T Mobility to demonstrate need for coverage and capacity have been determined by Hammett & Edison, and engineering consultant and independent third party to accurately represent the carrier's present and post-installation conclusions.
11. **Maintenance Schedule.** The proposed facility would operate without on-site staff but with a two-person maintenance crew visiting the property approximately once a month and on an as-needed basis to service and monitor the facility.
12. **Community Outreach.** Per the *Guidelines*, The Project Sponsor held a Community Outreach Meeting for the proposed project at 7:00 p.m. on June 9, 2011, at the Moscone Recreation Center, located at 1800 Chestnut Street. Nine (9) community members attended the meeting. Members inquired about health effects of RF emissions, safety standards, testing opportunities (RF exposure), and the design of the facility.
13. **Five-year plan:** Per the *Guidelines*, the Project Sponsor submitted an updated five-year plan, as required, in April 2013.
14. **Public Comment.** As of October 31, 2013, the Department has received eight comments regarding the proposed project. Residents and a neighborhood group (Union Street Association) indicated their opposition to the proposed project based on health concerns

related to RF emissions, the need for additional WTS facilities, compatibility with the residential nature of the neighborhood, and the visual impact of the facility as it relates to the historic nature of the facility and impact on the surrounding neighborhood.

15. **Planning Code Compliance.** The Commission finds that the Project is consistent with the relevant provisions of the Planning Code in the following manner:

A. **Use.** Per Planning Code Section 725.83, a Conditional Use authorization is required for the installation of Commercial Wireless Transmitting, Receiving or Relay Facility.

16. **Planning Code Section 303** establishes criteria for the Planning Commission to consider when reviewing applications for Conditional Use approval. On balance, the project does comply with said criteria in that:

A. The proposed new uses and building, at the size and intensity contemplated and at the proposed location, will provide a development that is necessary or desirable, and compatible with, the neighborhood or the community.

i. *Desirable: San Francisco is a leader of the technological economy; it is important and desirable to the vitality of the City to have and maintain adequate telecommunications coverage and data capacity. This includes the installation and upgrading of systems to keep up with changing technology and increases in usage. However, it is desirable for the City to allow wireless facilities to be installed, in such a manner as they are compatible with the subject building and surrounding neighborhood, in order to balance the provision of services and maintaining neighborhood character and/or the integrity of a building's architectural style, scale, and massing.*

*The proposed Project at 1700 Union Street is not generally desirable and compatible with the surrounding neighborhood because the Project would conflict with the design of the Project site and existing neighborhood character. The facility would create a negative impact on the aesthetic of the potential historic resource by failing to stealth and/or incorporate it into an existing feature. The Project would include five elements visible from off-site locations such as adjacent public rights-of-way on Gough and Union streets, which are identified as locations with an excellent quality of street views (including views of Fort Mason and the Presidio) by the San Francisco General Plan. These five elements include one façade mounted antenna, two roof-mounted antennas housed within faux roof vents, an approximately 4-foot tall roof-mounted equipment box, and other roof-mounted electronic equipment cabinets.*

*The placement of these elements would result in additions to the building that would appear incongruous with the building's design based on, but not limited to the following considerations:*

- *The addition of a façade-mounted box intended to screen one antenna would not be compatible with the north facing façade of the building, constructed in 1906,*

*which features period Neoclassical architectural details, such as an elaborate cornice detail, and a well-composed set of three (3) bay windows, featuring ionic pilasters. The box element would detract from the overall scale and massing of the building and is inconsistent with the architectural style. Furthermore, the northern elevation is made particularly prominent by virtue of its location along a mid-slope area (rising above the Marina Neighborhood to the north), for those traveling southbound along Gough Street into one of the cities' premier, well maintained, neighborhood commercial districts (Union Street – Marina Neighborhood), which is accessed at this intersection. An existing roof deck prevented moving this sector to a roof-mounted location.*

- *The addition of two roof-mounted faux vent pipes would introduce two six-foot tall elements, with a diameter of 18 inches, on a building in a manner that would appear out of place with respect to the size of the vent pipes. While vent pipes are commonly found on buildings, the proposed height, width, and size would noticeably exceed the typical dimensions of vent pipes, found on buildings of this size, location and land use. The scale of the facility (antennas and roof equipment) is made even more visually prominent given the relatively narrow lot frontage of 30 feet along Union Street. Furthermore, the siting of the building at a mid-slope location would result in prominent visibility of both the vent pipes, and the rooftop equipment, for locations to the south, which sit at a slightly higher elevation, such as Allyne Park/Octagon House (Designated Landmark No. 17). The rooftop elements would also detract from views of the Marina and waterfront for those traveling along northbound Gough Street toward the Union Street Neighborhood Commercial District Corridor.*
- ii. *Necessary: In the case of wireless installations, there are two criteria that the Commission reviews: coverage and capacity.*

*Coverage: San Francisco does have sufficient overall wireless coverage (note that this is separate from carrier capacity). San Francisco's unique coverage issues are due to topography and building heights. The hills and buildings disrupt lines of site between WTS base stations. Thus, telecommunication carriers continue to install additional installations to make sure coverage is sufficient.*

*Capacity: While a carrier may have adequate coverage in a certain area, the capacity may not be sufficient. With the continuous innovations in wireless data technology and demand placed on existing infrastructure, individual telecommunications carriers must upgrade and in some instances expand their facilities network to provide proper data and voice capacity. It is necessary for San Francisco, as a leader in technology, to have adequate capacity.*

*Disapproval of a base station, at this site does not prevent or inhibit AT&T Mobility from providing or improving their mobile telecommunication services to the residents, businesses, or visitors of the Marina. The proposed project at 1700 Union Street would*

*achieve sufficient street and in-building mobile phone coverage and data capacity; however alternate sites or designs would satisfy capacity and coverage objectives.*

- B. The proposed project will not be detrimental to the health, safety, convenience or general welfare of persons residing or working in the vicinity. There are no features of the project that could be detrimental to the health, safety or convenience of those residing or working the area, in that:

- i. Nature of proposed site, including its size and shape, and the proposed size, shape and arrangement of structures;

*The Project would have complied with all applicable Federal and State regulations to safeguard the health, safety and to ensure that persons residing or working in the vicinity would not be affected, and prevent harm to other personal property.*

*The Department of Public Health conducted an evaluation of potential health effects from Radio Frequency radiation, and concluded that the proposed wireless transmission facilities would have no adverse health effects if operated in compliance with the FCC-adopted health and safety standards.*

- ii. The accessibility and traffic patterns for persons and vehicles, the type and volume of such traffic, and the adequacy of proposed off-street parking and loading;

*Disapproval of the proposed Project would not have an impact on traffic or parking.*

- iii. The safeguards afforded to prevent noxious or offensive emissions such as noise, glare, dust and odor;

*Disapproval of the proposed Project would not have an impact on emissions such as noise, glare, dust or odor.*

- iv. Treatment given, as appropriate, to such aspects as landscaping, screening, open spaces, parking and loading areas, service areas, lighting and signs;

*Disapproval of the proposed Project would not have an effect on landscaping, screening, open spaces, parking and loading areas, service areas, lighting and signs.*

- C. That the use as proposed will comply with the applicable provisions of the Planning Code and will not adversely affect the General Plan.

*Disapproval of the proposed Project would not have an effect on the Planning Code and/or General Plan.*

- D. That the use as proposed would provide development that is in conformity with the purpose of the applicable Neighborhood Commercial District.

*The Project is not consistent with the purpose of Union Street Neighborhood Commercial district in that the facility would negatively alter the overall character of the building and negatively impact the surrounding area.*

17. **General Plan Compliance.** The Project is, on balance, consistent with the following Objectives and Policies of the General Plan

## HOUSING ELEMENT

### BALANCE HOUSING CONSTRUCTION AND COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE

#### OBJECTIVE 12 – BALANCE HOUSING GROWTH WITH ADEQUATE INFRASTRUCTURE THAT SERVES THE CITY’S GROWING POPULATION.

**POLICY 12.2** – Consider the proximity of quality of life elements, such as open space, child care, and neighborhood services, when developing new housing units.

**POLICY 12.3** – Ensure new housing is sustainable supported by the City’s public infrastructure systems.

*Disapproval of The Project would not impair AT&T Mobility’s coverage and capacity along Union Street, which is a primary neighborhood commercial corridor in the Marina neighborhood. While service coverage exists, alternate Project sites or technologies would allow AT&T Mobility to provide additional capacity for publicly-used telecommunications infrastructure in an alternate manner.*

## URBAN DESIGN

### HUMAN NEEDS

#### OBJECTIVE 4 - IMPROVEMENT OF THE NEIGHBORHOOD ENVIRONMENT TO INCREASE PERSONAL SAFETY, COMFORT, PRIDE AND OPPORTUNITY.

**POLICY 4.14** - Remove and obscure distracting and cluttering elements.

*The antennas would not be adequately concealed to reduce their visual impact, thereby introducing new elements considered distracting or cluttering. The height and bulk of the proposed faux vent pipes and enclosures and related equipment, would distract from, and clutter the visual aesthetic for the subject building and surrounding neighborhood.*

## COMMERCE AND INDUSTRY ELEMENT

### Objectives and Policies

**OBJECTIVE 1:**

MANAGE ECONOMIC GROWTH AND CHANGE TO ENSURE ENHANCEMENT OF THE TOTAL CITY LIVING AND WORKING ENVIRONMENT.

**Policy 1:**

Encourage development, which provides substantial net benefits and minimizes undesirable consequences. Discourage development, which has substantial undesirable consequences that cannot be mitigated.

**Policy 2:**

Assure that all commercial and industrial uses meet minimum, reasonable performance standards.

*Disapproval of the Project would not inhibit adjacent commercial uses from meeting reasonable performance standards.*

**OBJECTIVE 2:**

MAINTAIN AND ENHANCE A SOUND AND DIVERSE ECONOMIC BASE AND FISCAL STRUCTURE FOR THE CITY.

**Policy 1:**

Seek to retain existing commercial and industrial activity and to attract new such activity to the city.

**Policy 3:**

Maintain a favorable social and cultural climate in the city in order to enhance its attractiveness as a firm location.

*While the Project would ensure that residents and visitors have adequate service in the form of AT&T Mobility telecommunications, there are additional opportunities to consider alternate sites or technologies to enhance available communication services. Therefore, disapproval of the Project would not significantly impact the availability of adequate public services for both residents and visitors, nor would it prevent AT&T Mobility from providing or improving their telecommunications network.*

**OBJECTIVE 4:**

IMPROVE THE VIABILITY OF EXISTING INDUSTRY IN THE CITY AND THE ATTRACTIVENESS OF THE CITY AS A LOCATION FOR NEW INDUSTRY.

**Policy 1:**

Maintain and enhance a favorable business climate in the City.

**Policy 2:**

Promote and attract those economic activities with potential benefit to the City.

*Disapproval of the Project would ensure the character of the building and surrounding neighborhood is preserved, thereby promoting the architectural integrity of the Union Street Neighborhood Commercial District. The placement of such a facility using alternate sites or technologies would benefit the City by enhancing the business climate through improved communication services for residents and workers.*

## **VISITOR TRADE**

### **OBJECTIVE 8 - ENHANCE SAN FRANCISCO'S POSITION AS A NATIONAL CENTER FOR CONVENTIONS AND VISITOR TRADE.**

**POLICY 8.3** - Assure that areas of particular visitor attraction are provided with adequate public services for both residents and visitors.

*While the Project would ensure that residents and visitors have improved public service in the form of AT&T Mobility telecommunications, there are additional opportunities to consider alternate sites or technologies to enhance available communication services. Disapproval of establishing a base station at this site does not prevent AT&T Mobility from providing and/or improving the mobile telecommunication services in this area.*

## **COMMUNITY SAFETY ELEMENT**

### **Objectives and Policies**

#### **OBJECTIVE 3:**

**ENSURE THE PROTECTION OF LIFE AND PROPERTY FROM THE EFFECTS OF FIRE OR NATURAL DISASTER THROUGH ADEQUATE EMERGENCY OPERATIONS PREPARATION.**

#### **Policy 1:**

Maintain a local agency for the provision of emergency services to meet the needs of San Francisco.

#### **Policy 2:**

Develop and maintain viable, up-to-date in-house emergency operations plans, with necessary equipment, for operational capability of all emergency service agencies and departments.

#### **Policy 3:**

Maintain and expand agreements for emergency assistance from other jurisdictions to ensure adequate aid in time of need.

#### **Policy 4:**

Establish and maintain an adequate Emergency Operations Center.

**Policy 5:**

Maintain and expand the city's fire prevention and fire-fighting capability.

**Policy 6:**

Establish a system of emergency access routes for both emergency operations and evacuation.

*A disapproval of the Project would not significantly impact the City's disaster preparedness. While the Project would enhance the ability of the City to protect both life and property from the effects of a fire or natural disaster by providing communication services; there are alternate sites and/or technologies to enhance communication services.*

18. **Planning Code Section 101.1(b)** establishes eight priority-planning policies and requires review of permits for consistency with said policies. On balance, the project does comply with said policies in that:

A. That existing neighborhood-serving retail uses be preserved and enhanced and future opportunities for resident employment in and ownership of such businesses be enhanced.

*No neighborhood-serving retail use would be displaced by the disapproval of the project.*

B. That existing housing and neighborhood character be conserved and protected in order to preserve the cultural and economic diversity of our neighborhoods.

*No residential uses would be displaced or altered in any way by the disapproval of this authorization.*

C. That the City's supply of affordable housing be preserved and enhanced.

*The disapproval of the Project would have no adverse impact on housing in the vicinity.*

D. That commuter traffic not impede MUNI transit service or overburden our streets or neighborhood parking.

*The disapproval of the Project would not impede transit service or impact neighborhood parking.*

E. That a diverse economic base be maintained by protecting our industrial and service sectors from displacement due to commercial office development, and that future opportunities for resident employment and ownership in these sectors be enhanced.

*The disapproval of the Project would not cause displacement of industrial and service sector activity.*

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

*The disapproval of the Project will not negatively impact the property's ability to withstand an earthquake.*

- G. That landmarks and historic buildings be preserved.

*The subject site was developed in 1906 and is considered a Potential Historic Resource. The project would feature screening elements for antennas and equipment, which would be visible from select locations along adjacent public rights of way. The placement, design, and scale of the screening structures would obscure or detract from the historic nature of the building and other potentially significant buildings or views within the Marina or the Union Street corridor.*

- H. That our parks and open space and their access to sunlight and vistas be protected from development.

*The disapproval of the Project will have no adverse impact on parks or open space, or their access to sunlight. The placement, design, and scale of the screening structures would obscure or detract from the vistas such as that of the Marina neighborhood and waterfront areas as viewed from sites to the south such as northbound Gough Street and Allysne Park/Octagon House.*

19. The Project is consistent with and would promote the general and specific purposes of the Code provided under Section 101.1(b) in that, as designed, the Project would contribute to the character and stability of the neighborhood and would constitute a beneficial development.

**DECISION**

The Commission, after carefully balancing the competing public and private interests, and based upon the Recitals and Findings set forth above, in accordance with the standards specified in the Code, hereby **DISAPPROVES** the Conditional Use authorization under Planning Code Sections 725.83 and 303 to install up to three (3) screened (faux vent pipes and screened enclosures) panel antennas at the Project Site and as part of a wireless transmission network operated by AT&T Mobility on a Location Preference 6 (Limited Preference, Individual Neighborhood Commercial District) according to the Wireless Telecommunications Services (WTS) Siting Guidelines, within the Union Street Neighborhood Commercial Zoning District, and 40-X Height and Bulk District, as indicated on the plans on file with this application, dated March 3, 2013, and stamped "Exhibit B."

**APPEAL AND EFFECTIVE DATE OF MOTION:** Any aggrieved person may appeal this conditional use authorization to the Board of Supervisors within thirty (30) days after the date of this Motion No. xxxx. The effective date of this Motion shall be the date of this Motion if not appealed (after the 30-day period has expired) OR the date of the decision of the Board of Supervisors if appealed to the Board of Supervisors. For further information, please contact the Board of Supervisors at (415) 554-5184, City Hall, Room 244, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, San Francisco, CA 94102.

I hereby certify that the foregoing Motion was adopted by the Planning Commission on **November 7, 2013**.

JONAS P. IONIN  
Commission Secretary

AYES

NAYS:

ABSENT:

ADOPTED: November 7, 2013