

SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING COMMISSION

Meeting Minutes

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

Thursday, November 7, 2013

12:00 p.m.

Regular Meeting

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Fong, Wu, Antonini, Borden, Hillis, Moore, Sugaya
COMMISSIONER ABSENT: None

THE MEETING WAS CALLED TO ORDER BY PRESIDENT FONG AT 12:05 PM.

STAFF IN ATTENDANCE: John Rahaim – Planning Director, Kate Conner, Pilar LaValley, Diego Sanchez, Casey Noel, Paolo Ikezoe, Omar Masry, Jeanie Poling, Sharon Lai, and Jonas P. Ionin – Commission Secretary.

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.

- 1a. 2013.0401C (K. CONNER: (415) 575-6914)
875 AND 901 CALIFORNIA STREET - south side between Powell and Stockton Streets and at the southwest corner of the intersection of Powell and California Streets; Lot 017 in Assessor's Block 0256 and Lot 001 in Assessor's Block 0255 respectively - **Request for Conditional Use Authorization**, pursuant to Planning Code Sections 178, 303 and 304, to modify conditions of approval of a Planned Unit Development (PUD) located at 901 California Street (d.b.a Stanford Court Hotel) within the RM-4 (Residential, Mixed, High Density) Zoning District, the Nob Hill Special Use District, and 65-A and 320-E Height and Bulk District. Motion 6241 permitted a hotel with incidental commercial uses and

professional offices and conditioned that 100 parking spaces be provided within an existing garage located at 875 California Street, converting it entirely to parking for the hotel. The Project Sponsor is asking for a modification under Planning Code Section 304 to reduce the parking provided for the hotel to seven spaces, providing it in the hotel's existing porte cochere. A separate Conditional Use Authorization application, 2013.1130C, is being sought to reclassify the garage at 875 California Street as a community parking garage use.

(Continued from Regular Meeting of September 12, 2013)

(Proposed for Continuance to January 23, 2014)

SPEAKERS: None
 ACTION: Continued to January 23, 2013
 AYES: Fong, Wu, Antonini, Borden, Hillis, Moore, Sugaya

- 1b. 2013.1130C (K. CONNER: (415) 575-6914)
875 CALIFORNIA STREET - south side between Powell and Stockton Streets; Lot 017 in Assessor's Block 0256 - **Request for Conditional Use Authorization**, pursuant to Planning Code Sections 209.7 (a) and 303, to operate a community garage within the RM-4 (Residential, Mixed, High Density) Zoning District, the Nob Hill Special Use District, and 65-A Height and Bulk District. The current use of the building is a garage associated with the Stanford Court Hotel.

(Continued from Regular Meeting of September 12, 2013)

(Proposed for Continuance to January 23, 2014)

SPEAKERS: None
 ACTION: Continued to January 23, 2013
 AYES: Fong, Wu, Antonini, Borden, Hillis, Moore, Sugaya

2. 2013.0921C (D. SÁNCHEZ: (415) 575-9082)
350 8TH STREET - northwest corner of 8th and Harrison Streets, with frontage on Ringold and Gordon Streets, Lots 003 and 015 in Assessor's Block 3756 - **Request for Conditional Use Authorization** pursuant to Planning Code Section 303 to modify Conditions of Approval 20A and 20B of Motion 18766 to reduce the percentage of on-site affordable units from 15% of dwelling units (62 affordable dwelling units) to 12% of dwelling units (49 affordable dwelling units) pursuant to Proposition C. The project is located in the WMUG (Western SoMa Mixed Use – General) Zoning District, the Western SOMA Special Use District and 55/65-X Height and Bulk District. This action constitutes the Approval Action for the project for the purposes of CEQA, pursuant to Section 31.04(h) of the San Francisco Administrative Code.

Preliminary Recommendation: Approve with Conditions

(Continued from Regular Meeting of October 24, 2013)

WITHDRAWN

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

3. 2011.0544C (O. MASRY: (415) 575-9116)
1700 UNION STREET - at the northwest corner of Union and Gough Street, Lot 002A in Assessor's Block 0529 - **Request for Conditional Use Authorization** under Planning Code Sections 725.83 and 303 for a wireless telecommunications services (WTS) facility operated by AT&T Mobility. The proposed macro WTS facility would consist of three panel antennas and related electronic equipment. Two antennas would be façade mounted and screened with a fiberglass panel painted to match the building. The third antenna would be housed in a faux roof vent. Electronic equipment would be roof mounted and screened from view. The facility is proposed at a Location Preference 6 Site (Individual Neighborhood Commercial District) within the Union Street Neighborhood Commercial Zoning, and 40-X Height and Bulk Districts. This action constitutes the Approval Action for the project for the purposes of CEQA, pursuant to Section 31.04(h) of the San Francisco Administrative Code.
Preliminary Recommendation: Approve with Conditions
(Continued from Regular Meeting of October 3, 2013)
NOTE: On September 19, 2013, following public hearing and closing public comment, the Commission indicated their concern regarding the proposed design and continued the matter to October 3, 2013, by a vote (+7 -0).
NOTE: On October 17, 2013, after adopting a Motion of Intent to Disapprove by a vote of +4 -3 (Borden, Sugaya, Fong against); the Commission continued the matter to November 7, 2013 by a vote of +5 -2 (Sugaya, Fong against).

SPEAKERS: Tedi Vriheas – Request for continuance
ACTION: After being pulled off of Consent; the Project Sponsor requested the item be continued; a motion to Disapprove was superseded by a motion to continue; and the matter was Continued to January 23, 2013
AYES: Fong, Wu, Antonini, Borden
NAYES: Hillis, Moore, Sugaya

4. 2013.0486C (C. NOEL: (415) 575-9125)
750 27TH STREET - north side of 27th Street between Diamond and Douglass Streets, Assessor's Block 6583, Lot 010 - **Request for Conditional Use Authorization** under Planning Code Sections 209.1(f) and 303. The proposal would add a second dwelling unit at the ground level on a lot exceeding 6,000 Square Feet. The proposal to convert a single-family dwelling to a two-family dwelling will not exceed the existing building envelope; the new unit will be created out of existing storage area and crawlspace. The project site is located within a RH-1 (Residential – House, One 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 Section 31.04(h) of the San Francisco Administrative Code.
Preliminary Recommendation: Approve with Conditions

SPEAKERS: None
ACTION: Approved with Conditions
AYES: Fong, Wu, Antonini, Borden, Hillis, Moore, Sugaya
MOTION: 19015

5. 2013.1285C (P. LAVALLEY: (415) 575-9084)
1095 MARKET STREET - southeast corner of Market and 7th Streets, Assessor's Block 3703, Lot 059 - **Request for an amendment to the conditions of approval for a previously**

approved Conditional Use Authorization under Planning Code Sections 216(b) and 303. The proposal would extend the performance period for an additional three years for a previously approved project (Motion No. 18199, Case No. 2009.1100C) to convert the building use from office to a 42,000 square foot, 94-room, R-1 occupancy hostel/hotel with 2,500 square feet of ground floor commercial (restaurant) use, 3,500 square feet of nighttime entertainment use, and two rooftop terraces totally 8,500 square feet, and to seismically strengthen and rehabilitate the existing historic 9-story (including basement) building. The building is listed as a Category I (Significant) Building within Article 11 of the Planning Code. On October 6, 2010, the Historic Preservation Commission granted a Permit to Alter with conditions for Case No. 2009.1100H. The amendment proposes no changes to the design or intensity of the project as originally approved. The subject building is in a C-3-G (Downtown General) Zoning District, and 90-X Height and Bulk District.

Recommendation: Approve with Conditions

SPEAKERS: None
 ACTION: Continued to November 21, 2013
 AYES: Fong, Wu, Antonini, Borden, Hillis, Moore, Sugaya

C. COMMISSION MATTERS

6. Consideration of Adoption:

- Draft Minutes for October 17, 2013 – Special Meeting
- Draft Minutes for October 17, 2013 – Regular Meeting
- Draft Minutes for October 24, 2013 – Regular Meeting

SPEAKERS: None
 ACTION: Adopted
 AYES: Fong, Wu, Antonini, Borden, Hillis, Moore, Sugaya

Adoption of Commission Minutes – Charter Section 4.104 requires all commissioners to vote yes or no on all matters unless that commissioner is excused by a vote of the Commission. Commissioners may not be automatically excluded from a vote on the minutes because they did not attend the meeting.

7. Commission Comments/Questions

- Inquiries/Announcements. Without discussion, at this time Commissioners may make announcements or inquiries of staff regarding various matters of interest to the Commissioner(s).
- Future Meetings/Agendas. At this time, the Commission may discuss and take action to set the date of a Special Meeting and/or determine those items that could be placed on the agenda of the next meeting and other future meetings of the Planning Commission.

Commissioner Antonini:

A couple of observations in regards to the vote on Tuesday. And, you know, while I was disappointed in the result I was not commenting so much on the result regarding Measures B and C, but rather that a vote even took place. As most of you know who follow the Planning Commission, that particular project and what it has been through, 10 years if you count the original

presentation of the project, and at least 7 years on this, and also a study on addressing particularly height and a lot of other things. I think in fairness to the voters it's very hard to vote on a complicated issue like this, based on sound bites and for someone really to understand the whole issue is quite difficult and that is why, if there is going to be a vote on issues in the future, hopefully it will occur at the beginning of the process not at the end. Because, if a developer or anyone who hopes to invest in San Francisco, is faced with the possibility that they may go through years of approval processes, of carefully crafted projects and lots of benefits given to the City and still be, even -- after court actions, be subject to a vote, it could quickly turn around our economy that seems to be moving very well at the present time, as we'll hear from the Commerce & Industry Inventory later on. But, even in that measure there are some points that some of the things can be better and certainly we've seen our economy go south really quickly in the past, in the 80s and also in the first part of this century. And often times, in most, many instances it's the political process not the desirability of San Francisco that turns away people who are interested in our City. I would like to find out, it's not a Planning issue, but what the level of votes are needed to put a referendum on the ballot, if that is the appropriate, if that needs to be something that we have to look at in the future. One other thing, there was a very good editorial in the San Francisco Business Times last week, and it dealt with -- basically it dealt with a particular possible future project, but the point it made is, the opponents to this and other projects, have said we only want affordable housing and that is kind of unrealistic point of view to take, because funding has to come from somewhere and to have a very beneficial project, much of the money that is generated from it, will go towards affordable housing, but it does not make sense economically for anyone, even non-profits or government to be able to fund something that doesn't have some profit end to it. So I would recommend you read that editorial, I think it is quite good.

Commissioner Sugaya:

A couple of things, can we have a status report on the Academy of Art at some point in the very near future?, because after a hia -- some pointed activity that took place involving the City Attorney's Office, etc., and some deadlines that were established earlier this year we haven't heard anything to date so if we could get a status report that would be great. Also to staff I'd like to know the history of reporting on below market rate units at 901 Bush Street. I believe when that went condominium there are one or two BMR units in there, and I assume there's some kind of reporting mechanism that is supposed to take place to make sure that those are actually BMR, so could we look into that. I just can't resist, I don't think the San Francisco economy is going to fall because one development happened to be voted down. And city building is more susceptible to national -- and international economic cycles than any kind of political or other whims that have come along over the decades of building in San Francisco. Even Proposition M has not thwarted office development to the degree that people thought it would. Even now with the office boom, there seems to be, for the near future, square footages available for absorption, and so I don't think that individual, one single project, will have any effect on the future development of both apartments, condominiums and offices in San Francisco.

Commissioner Moore:

I want to take a second crack at that as well. I would definitely support the idea that investment -- international investment is attracted to cities, which have strong city governments and strong living design plans, which help create an equal play field in high-rise friendly environment. However, in order to create liveable cities for work and play that high-rise development needs to be interpreted and governed by rules which apply to all. I want to live it with that, and I want to ask staff to please give us an update on how the electorate vote on 8 Washington, indeed, will effect future actions? How does this vote effect decisions that we have made in the past on the project? How will the voters' vote effect what can be done in the future? We all know that this site will be

developed on in some form or another; however, I like to see how the vote modifies what has been brought to bear before, based on our approvals.

Commissioner Sugaya:

I want to add quickly, I think that also should include any considerations for how the environmental and CEQA process would work on any subsequent proposed project.

Commissioner Wu:

I want to talk about two meetings I went to; one was with Director Rahaim, two days ago in SOMA. A number of community based groups from the Mission, SOMA, Eastern and Western SOMA asked for an update to the Eastern Neighborhoods Plan. It's been – I believe it will be five years, next January from the date that it was effective, and so, I believe Director Rahaim, has asked staff to prepare a memo for the Commission and to have it here at Commission. And on October 30th, I spoke at a conference called Just Bay Area, a number of staff were there, Ms. Rogers and a number of staff from Citywide. I thought it was a great opportunity to try tackle some of these really big regional problems with affordable housing, and dealing with the Housing Element, and dealing with the Arena. And so, it was great to see so many cities there, so many different community based organizations there, and hope that we can keep the conversation going. I believe all of the talks were recorded and they will be on the website of the Local Initiatives Support Corporation.

Commissioner Hillis:

Just a follow-up on the 8 Washington postmortem, I think, no matter what side you were on, I thought it was a well planned project. I think everybody, the proponents, the opponents talked about the affordability issue being the main issue on this, which I think was true. Throughout, we certainly hear this week in and week out. I think it would be good if we have a discussion here at some point, on that question of what the City is doing about affordable housing in general. Because -- reading the Chronicle, editorialized on the vote, I think today or yesterday and then it kind of got into a decision about the Arena, which I don't think was really the issue, the issue was affordability and the Arena is not going to really effect affordability in the City. I think things like how do we get redevelopment back? Do we do another affordable housing bond? You know, the Port has a lot of vacant seawall lots, and can affordable housing be built on those other seawall lots. Issues we should talk about, and maybe an update from the City family on how they are tackling that issue and how we can contribute to it.

Commissioner Moore:

There was a lot of resonance on Ms. Wu's comments on affordability and the future of Chinatown, actually, I picked up an article abroad in the International Financial Business Times, which quoted her, and I thought it was very interesting, because we had a discussion here, and I think we all heard her position, which I strongly supported and it made the international news, which I think is very good.

D. DEPARTMENT MATTERS

8. Director's Announcements

Director of Current Planning Jeff Joslin:

First of all, you have a Director's Report in your packet, which identifies our new public outreach engagement website. If you haven't looked at it, it's a great portal to all planning related items of particular public interest. So sorry, secondly a more specific announcement, as you know the Department recently published the Transit Effectiveness Project Draft Environmental Impact Report, the public comment period of the draft EIR ended in September. However, the MTA Board

will be holding an informational meeting on the service changes on Tuesday, December 3rd. The Board meetings are held in this room from 1:00 to 3:00 p.m.. And lastly, I want to report briefly on a recent conference that occurred here, a National Green Roofs Conference, called Cities Alive 11th Annual Conference, which brought experts and aficionados from the Green Roof and Green Wall realm to San Francisco. The Conference, coming here, prompted Planning and SPUR to initiate a task force, which resulted in a greener and better road map for San Francisco. Participating in that task force were a number of other Departments, PUC, DBI, SF Environment, as well as representatives from the trades, and real estate, and armed with that, and the results of the Conference, the Department is now forwarding, with those associated agencies, a plan for moving forward to define some potential policy and regulations around future green roofs for the City. If there are no questions that concludes my report.

9. Review of Past Week's Events at the Board of Supervisors, Board of Appeals and Historic Preservation Commission

LAND USE COMMITTEE: None

FULL BOARD OF SUPERVISORS:

- **Supervisor Avalos's Outer Mission NCD was approved on first read.** This Commission heard the item in April of this year and recommended approval with modifications. The new NCD would replace existing minimum parking requirements with maximum parking controls, prohibit fringe financial services, offer a 5' height bonus for active uses and institute a buffer between medical cannabis dispensaries. If you recall, the most controversial aspect of this ordinance was prohibiting new MCDs from locating within 500 feet of an existing MCD. The Commission's substantive recommendation was to require Conditional Use for MCDs within 500 of another MCD, rather than banning them outright. The Supervisor integrated all of the Commission's recommendations into the revised Ordinance.
- **Also at the Board was Supervisor Avalos's Ordinance that would direct the Planning Commission to submit a report to the Board of Supervisors evaluating the Planning Code controls for medical cannabis dispensaries.** This ordinance would require the report to be delivered to the Board by Jan 1, 2014. Although this ordinance is not yet law, we've known about Supervisor Avalos' request since early this summer. As such, Planning staff have already started the report and have tentatively reserved space on the Commission's 12/5 agenda. At the Board hearing this week Supervisor Campos expressed concern that this important issue needs more time for outreach—and he amended the ordinance to change the report deadline to May 1st, while also emphasizing that the Commission could submit a report earlier if appropriate **This item was approved with the amended date.** Since the hearing, planning staff have reached out to Supervisor Campos with our outreach strategy and requested his input for additional outreach—while at the same time cautioning that this work is additional, unfunded work and his assistance on outreach would be greatly appreciated.
- **Appeal of CU for a Wireless Antenna at 725 Taraval.** The Planning Commission approved this CU, unanimously, on 10/29/13. It was for a 9 panel WTS facility antennas, screened by minor additions to two existing penthouse structures. The appellants submitted an appeal without providing any justification other than "building code, fire code, planning code, improper and false report of the Planning Dept". At the hearing, the appellant articulated his understanding of the Planning Code and staff clarified the misinterpretation as well as the reasons why this Commission found the project to be necessary or desirable and compatible with the community. Only two speakers opposed the project. Supervisor Yee is the district supervisor for the project area and led the

question by seeking clarity on the Code, the wireless guidelines and the alternative site analysis submitted (voluntarily) by the project sponsor. **After hearing presentations from all parties, the Supervisor moved to approve the CU and the vote was in unanimous support.**

INTRODUCTIONS:

- **BF 131059 Allowing Certain Non-Conforming Structures to be Rebuilt Under Certain Conditions Ordinance** amending the Planning Code to allow non-conforming secondary structures in a C-3-R Zoning District to be demolished and rebuilt to the prior non-conforming size under certain conditions. (Mayor/Chiu)
- **131063 Planning and Administrative Codes - Construction of In-Law Units in Existing Residential Buildings or Auxiliary Structures on the Same Lot; Rent Control.** Ordinance amending the Planning Code to allow the construction of an additional dwelling unit or units within the existing envelope of a residential building or auxiliary structure on the same lot (In-Law Units) on any parcel in the Castro Street Neighborhood Commercial District and within 1,750 feet of the District boundaries, excluding any lot within 500 feet of Block No. 2623, Lot Nos. 116 through 154; and authorizing the Zoning Administrator to waive density and other Planning Code requirements in order to create the In-Law Units; amending the Administrative Code to provide that an In-Law Unit constructed with a waiver of code requirements shall be subject to the provisions of the San Francisco Residential Rent Stabilization and Arbitration Ordinance if the existing building, or any existing dwelling unit, is already subject to the Rent Ordinance. (Wiener)
- **131064 Planning Code - Definition of Bona Fide Eating Place.** Ordinance amending the Planning Code to expand the definition of "bona fide eating place" to include a definition based on food sales per occupant. (Wiener)
- **131068 Interim Zoning Controls - Residential Uses in Commercial Buildings in an Area Bounded by Market, Second, Brannan, Division, and South Van Ness Streets.** Resolution imposing interim zoning controls to prohibit, for a 12-month period, the issuance of building permits for certain commercial uses in the area bounded by Market Street from Van Ness Street east to 2nd Street, 2nd Street south to Brannan Street, Brannan Street west to Division Street, and South Van Ness Street north to Market Street and to require the Planning and Building Departments to complete a study of the conversion of commercial spaces to residential uses in this area. (Kim)
- **Hearing Request from Supe Campos:** Hearing on the Budget and Legislative Analyst report to further understand the level of San Francisco's housing crisis as well as to hear from any interested party about potential solutions. San Francisco will not continue to be a diverse and vibrant City for all if everyone but the ultra rich is priced out.
- **131085 Planning Code - Fulton Street Grocery Store Special Use District Ordinance** amending the Planning Code, Section 249.35A to allow a grocery store that may be defined as a formula retail use. **Breed**
- **131086 Planning Code - 1500 Page Street Affordable Housing Special Use District.** Ordinance amending the Planning Code to establish the 1500 Page Street Affordable Housing Special Use District (SUD) for the property located at 1500 Page Street (Assessor's Block No. 1223, Lot No. 004) and repeal the provisions establishing the 1500 Page Street Residential Care SUD; amending the Zoning Map to add the 1500 Page Street Affordable Housing SUD. **Breed**

BOARD OF APPEALS:

No Report

HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION:

Good afternoon Commissioners, Tim Frye Department staff, here to share with you yesterday – the events from yesterday’s Historic Preservation Commission hearing. The Commission had a very short hearing with only one item on its regular calendar, in which they forwarded a final recommendation to landmark Marcus’ Books pursuant to Article 10 of the Planning Code. That recommendation will be forwarded to the Board of Supervisors for it’s consideration at a future hearing. We have a couple of other announcements the Twin Peaks Tavern local landmark designation was one of four projects celebrating LGBT heritage, that was honored at the Annual LGTB Benefit at the National Trust Conference in Indianapolis, Indiana last week. Myself, along with Moses Corrette and HPC Commissioner Andrew Wolfram were present and represented the project at the event. Other projects recognized in this ceremony included St. Vincent’s Hospital AIDS Memorial Project in New York City. A survey effort happening in Indianapolis, Indiana regarding LGBT history. And our own development of the SF LGBT Historic Context Statement, which is been funded through the Historic Preservation Fund Committee. Also you may be aware there was a fire that broke out on the Juliuss Castle, on October 28, it was a small fire and according to the owner, sparks landed on the wood parapet during the insulation of a hot applied roof membrane, after work was completed, for the day, is when the fire was broke out. There was no fire watch person on site to monitor the work. Following the torching, which is why the fire was able to spread so quickly, the fire caused complete damage and destruction of the entire length of the historic crenellated wood parapet and the building interior also sustained some water damage. The project sponsor was at yesterday’s HPC hearing made some comments to the Commission and he’s been working closely with staff to make sure that those elements can be reconstructed. As part of the CofA he just received, to return a restaurant use back to the property. We’ll keep you posted those efforts as they move along. And finally, I want to let you know, I’ll be at next week regularly schedule Graffiti Advisory Board Hearing, in light of the recent tagging of a couple building in downtown, and in particular Hibernia Bank. The Advisory Board, has asked how Planning can work more closely with them, just on education, law enforcement and abatement, especially when it pertains to graffiti on local landmark buildings. I will also report back to you the outcome of that hearing, next week. That concludes my comments unless you have any questions.

10. (P. IKEZOE: (415) 575-9137)

COMMERCE AND INDUSTRY INVENTORY 2012 - Informational presentation - This 19th Inventory is one of the Department’s reports on the economy and land use. It contains a 10-year time-series of data for calendar years 2003-2012, including population, labor force, employment, establishments, wages, retail sales, government expenditures and revenues, and building activity. The Inventory is available for the public at the Planning Department and can be downloaded from the website at [http://commissions.sfplanning.org/cpcpackets/2012 Commerce and Industry Inventory FINAL.pdf](http://commissions.sfplanning.org/cpcpackets/2012%20Commerce%20and%20Industry%20Inventory%20FINAL.pdf)

Preliminary Recommendation: None – Informational

SPEAKERS: None

ACTION: None - Informational

E. GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT – 15 MINUTES

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. However, for items where public comment is closed this is your opportunity to address the Commission. With respect to all other 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: Gayle Cahill – Warriors project
 Robert Scripp – Warriors Arena
 Rudy Nothenberg – Piers 30-32 and Seawall lot
 Linda Chapman – 1601 Larkin
 David Heartzell - Development process
 Sue Hestor – Warriors
 Patricia Loveluck – Code enforcement
 Lotus Yee Fong – 1601 Larkin
 Michelle McGill – Warriors Arena

F. REGULAR CALENDAR

11. 2011.1306E (J. POLING: (415) 575-9072)
1634-1690 PINE STREET - north side of Pine Street between Franklin Street and Van Ness Avenue; Lots 007, 008, 009, 010, and 010A in Assessor's Block 0647 - **Public Hearing on the Draft Environmental Impact Report.** The project site is occupied by five vacant one- to two-story buildings and a parking lot. The proposed project would merge the six lots into one parcel, demolish most of the existing five buildings, and construct a 130-foot-tall 353,360-gross-square-foot building containing 262 residential units in two 13-story towers, 5,600 square feet of commercial use on the ground and second floors, and one level of below-grade parking for 245 vehicles and 91 bicycles. Three of the existing building façades would be restored and incorporated into the proposed project. The project site is within the NC-3 (Moderate-Scale Neighborhood Commercial) Zoning District, the Van Ness Automotive Special Use District, and a 130-E Height and Bulk District. The five buildings on the project site comprise the entire Pine Street Auto Shops Historic District. **Written comments will be accepted at the Planning Department until 5:00 p.m. on November 18, 2013.**
 Preliminary Recommendation: None

SPEAKERS: - Michael Desend – This is a neighborhood
 = Desiree Smith – Adequacy and accuracy regarding cultural resources
 - Patricia Loveluck – Reliability of traffic statistics, and analysis

ACTION: Accepted public comment

12. 2013.0361C (S. LAI: (415) 575-9087)
1409 SUTTER STREET - south side between Gough and Franklin Streets; Lot 025-028 in Assessor's Block 0689 - **Request for Conditional Use Authorization**, pursuant to Planning Code Sections 121, 712.21, 712.55, 790.46, and 790.130, to establish a new 10-room tourist hotel (d.b.a. Leader House) within an existing four-story commercial building, where the last known authorized use was a private club. The project also includes the establishment of a new restaurant. Both proposed uses are in excess of the use size limit of 6,000 square feet. The project site is located within a NC-3 (Neighborhood Commercial, Moderate-Scale) Zoning District, and 130-E Height and Bulk District. This action constitutes the Approval Action for the project for the purposes of CEQA, pursuant to Section 31.04(h) of the San Francisco Administrative Code.
 Preliminary Recommendation: Approve with Conditions
(Continued from Regular Meeting of October 17, 2013)

SPEAKERS: + Patrice Fambrini – Project introduction
+ Jin Yao – Project description
+ Moshin Denar – Project Architect
- Susan Colton – hotel impacts

ACTION: Approved with Conditions

AYES: Fong, Wu, Antonini, Borden, Hillis, Moore, Sugaya

MOTION: 19016

G. 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 with one exception. When the agenda item has already been reviewed in a public hearing at which members of the public were allowed to testify and the Commission has closed the public hearing, your opportunity to address the Commission must be exercised during the Public Comment portion of the Calendar. Each member of the public may address the Commission for up to three minutes.

The Brown Act forbids a commission from taking action or discussing any item not appearing on the posted agenda, including those items raised at public comment. In response to public comment, the commission is limited to:

- (1) responding to statements made or questions posed by members of the public; or
- (2) requesting staff to report back on a matter at a subsequent meeting; or
- (3) directing staff to place the item on a future agenda. (Government Code Section 54954.2(a))

ADJOURNMENT – 2:13 P.M.