

SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING COMMISSION



DRAFT – Meeting Minutes

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

Thursday, March 6, 2014
12:00 p.m.
Regular Meeting

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Wu, Fong, Antonini, Borden, Hillis, Moore, Sugaya

THE MEETING WAS CALLED TO ORDER BY VICE PRESIDENT FONG AT 12: 07 P.M.

STAFF IN ATTENDANCE: John Rahaim – Planning Director, Scott Sanchez – Zoning Administrator, Casey Noel, Kate McGee, Kimia Haddadan, Michael E. Smith, 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.

SPEAKERS: Sue Hestor – Re: 3660 21st Street. Notice not received by DR requestor
Arran Pera – Re: 3660 21st Street – Did not receive notice on the matter
Alice Barkley – Re: 3660 21st Street – Pre-application meeting, 311 notice, alleged new information

8. [2013.1859C](#) (T. CHANG: (415) 575-9197)
1501 SLOAT BOULEVARD (LAKESHORE PLAZA) - The project site is located at 1501 Sloat Boulevard within the Lakeshore Plaza Shopping Center, south side of the street between Everglade and Clearfield Drives - **Request for Conditional Use Authorization**, pursuant to Planning Code Sections 303 and 703.4, to establish a formula retail limited-restaurant (d.b.a. Subway) in the 810 square-foot tenant space occupied by Quizno's formula retail

limited-restaurant located within a NC-S (Neighborhood Commercial, Shopping Center) District, the Lakeshore Plaza Special Use District and 26-40-X Height and Bulk District. This action constitutes the Approval Action for the project for purposes of CEQA, pursuant to Section 31.04(h) of the San Francisco Administrative Code.

Preliminary Recommendation: Approve with Conditions

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

9. [2010.0726X](#) (B.FU: (415) 558-6613)
2051 3RD STREET - east side between Mariposa and 18th Streets, Lots 001B, 001C, and 006 in Assessor's Block 3994 - **Request under Planning Code Section 329 for Large Project Authorization** and exceptions including rear yard per Planning Code Section 134, open space per Planning Code Section 135, and street frontage per Planning Code Section 145.1 for the proposed construction of a new six-story, 68-foot building consisting of up to 94 dwelling units, approximately 800 square feet of retail space, and parking for up to 77 spaces. The subject property is located within the UMU (Urban Mixed Use) District and 68-X Height and Bulk District. This action constitutes the Approval Action for the project for purposes of CEQA, pursuant to Section 31.04(h) of the San Francisco Administrative Code.
 Preliminary Recommendation: Approve with Conditions

SPEAKERS: Steve Williams – Re: 2051 3rd Street – April 10, 2014
 Jason Scheck – Re: 2051 3rd Street – March 27, 2014
 ACTION: Continued to March 27, 2014
 AYES: Wu, Fong, Antonini, Borden, Hillis, Moore, Sugaya

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

1. [2014.0107C](#) (C. NOEL: (415) 575.9125)
1735 NORIEGA STREET - south side between 24th and 25th Avenues, Lot 047 in Assessor's Block 2061 - **Request for Conditional Use Authorization**, pursuant to Planning Code Section 303, to allow the change of use from a Retail Grocery to a Restaurant (d.b.a Sunset Reservoir Brewing Company). The project requires conditional use authorization for the change of use from a Retail Grocery to a Restaurant (Section 303(m)) and to create a use that is more than 3,999 square-feet (Section 739.21). The subject property is located within the Noriega Street Neighborhood Commercial District and 40-X Height and Bulk District. This action constitutes the Approval Action for the project for 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: Wu, Fong, Antonini, Borden, Hillis, Moore, Sugaya
MOTION: 19098

C. COMMISSION MATTERS

2. Consideration of Adoption:

- [Draft Minutes for February 20, 2014](#)

SPEAKERS: None
ACTION: Adopted
AYES: Wu, Fong, 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.

3. 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:

Yeah, just commenting on, there was an article in the Chronicle on Sunday, which was interesting, written by Heather Knight. It talked about the discrepancy between the highest income and lowest income groups in San Francisco. Apparently, it was set to be the highest in the United States, but I think when we look at these sort of things, we have to realize San Francisco is a special situation. First of all, we're a City and County, so that being said, often times other cities which are being compared are part of the county and generally affordability requirements or suggestions are by a county level, and so in many instances, you will have public housing or affordable housing spread out throughout many cities in a county. It might lessen the amount of that type of housing, in a particular city, that's the focus of the study, also in San Francisco you dealing with a city surrounded by water and the victim of decision in 1856, which I think was unfortunate, when the county line was put right south of San Francisco and the rest of -- was San Francisco was made into San Mateo County so, what you have is in cities very close to San Francisco, like Pacifica, Daly City, which incidentally is the highest populated city in San Mateo County, with a 105,000 residents, and Colma and South City, and Pacifica, are a lot -- of housing that's a little bit more affordable particularly to the middle class so I think if you looked at San Francisco, in the context, what most of the other cities that are being compared, it would be that it include areas that are just to the periphery of these cities, then you probably get a little different take on this difference between incomes and the lack of middle income residents. Although we do have a big problem, because we don't have enough housing that is acceptable for people in the middle income range, particularly those with families, particularly houses that are single family homes that are attractive to people, who have children, and we have to strive to build as many as we can, I doubt we are going to be able to change the county line and you know the Bay is where it is, and some of these other factors are beyond our control, but we certainly can ameliorate some of the problems by preserving as many single-family homes as we can and by creating, as many new ones as we can, with

the land that is available, so, I think when we read this study we have to kind of realize, you know, we're comparing apples and oranges even New York City, which has -- is a city with 5 counties or 5 boroughs, although there's more of a density than San Francisco, there's more room to spread housing out in the different boroughs, it's not like San Francisco. San Francisco is more like Manhattan, where it is much denser and more concentrated. So, it's always good to read these and kind of look at all the factors involved.

Commissioner Wu:

I wanted to comment on what's called the Housing Production Summary. I think the name is going to change, it's been updated, it's the comparison of what's been entitled and built compared to the arena goals. And so, we now have the numbers through the end of 2013, starting in 2007 and in the over-moderate category there has been 190 percent of what was projected, so you know we are clearly way over in the over-moderate category, and then under on the goals for all the other ones. I just want to mention this to say that, I believe a number of discussions will be happening about the Housing Element upcoming, and I think that we should use this to guide our policy development going into that process.

D. DEPARTMENT MATTERS

4. [Director's Announcements](#)

Director Rahaim:

Good afternoon, Commissioners. Just wanted to let you know that we're kicking off a new Public Realm Design Plan for Ocean Avenue and we are having two public events in the next few days. One is this Saturday, which is a site walk on Ocean Avenue, from 10:00 A.M. to noon, meeting at the Fog Lifter Café, which is at 1901 Ocean Avenue and the second is next Wednesday the 12th from 6:00 to 8:00 pm., at Lick-Wilmerding High School, which is 755 Ocean. We are kicking this off with our partners and the other agencies in the local community to look at pedestrian improvements on Ocean Avenue. Secondly, there was a -- you might have heard that there was a press conference this morning, the Mayor and several Department heads were there to announce the new Pedestrian Safety Strategy for the City reflecting the need to really increase pedestrian safety in much of the City because pedestrian accidents have been on the increase in the last couple years, and the Mayor and Department heads and Board of Supervisors are all together putting forth this strategy that would not only look at enforcement issues, but design issues and short term solutions that will help improve pedestrian conditions all over the City, interesting statistic is that, there are six street segments that are responsible for 60 percent of the serious accidents, so this strategy will obviously looking at those segments of streets very intensely from a design standpoint, and a management standpoint, enforcement standpoint, to really address those issues. So we'll keep you informed on the statistics as we move forward, as this is implemented. That concludes my report.

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

LAND USE COMMITTEE: NONE

FULL BOARD OF SUPERVISORS:

- **140136 Market & Octavia CAC Appts.:** Krute Singa, Kenneth Wingard, Dennis Richards, and Jason Henderson Approved.
- **Landmark Designation for 660 California Street.** This property is commonly known as Old St. Mary's Rectory. The designation will change from an "unrated" building to a "contributory"

building. The HPC recommended making this change on Nov. 20, 2013. **This week the Full Board approved the ordinance on FINAL reading.**

- **Zoning Map change for St. Boniface.** This property is located in the Tenderloin. Supervisor Kim sponsored the rezoning. The rezoning from RC-4 to C-3-G will enable the existing landmark building to be eligible for transferable development rights. In January of this year both the Historic Preservation Commission and the Planning Commission recommended approval. **This week the Full Board recommended approval on first reading.**
- **Planning Code Text Change.** This change would allow certain nonconforming structures to be rebuilt. The Planning Commission considered this ordinance most recently on Feb 6, 2014. At that hearing the Commission voted 3-3 to recommend approval. As there were not four affirmative votes, this constituted a failed motion. After the hearing, the 90-day limit for a Commission recommendation expired—this resulted in a defacto recommendation of disapproval. At the Board's committee hearing last week Supervisor Kim amended the ordinance to specific that the text change only apply to the block and lot with the proposed Apple Store. **This week the Full Board approved the ordinance with that amendment and supporting findings, on first reading.**

INTRODUCTIONS:

- **Supervisor Mar** introduced a hearing request on the Budget & Legislative Analyst's report on SF's strategies to prevent & fill commercial vacancies.
- **Mayor Lee and Supervisors Cohen, Campos & Chiu,** introduced a revised version of the ordinance to amend Production, Distribution, and Repair (or PDR) Zoning Controls. Commission, this revised ordinance is currently scheduled for your consideration next week.

BOARD OF APPEALS:

No Report

HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION:

Good Afternoon Commissioners, Tim Frye, Department staff, here to share with you the results from yesterday, Historical Preservation Commission hearing, just one item to share with you. The HPC gave its final recommendation to the Board of Supervisors for the landmark designation of the Dunham Carrigan & Hayden Building at 2 Henry Adams. The building is significant for its association with the company and with the products that the company produced during the gold rush as well as the post 1906 reconstruction. The building is also a fine example of the early 20th Century American Commercial Style, constructed of brick and heavy timber framing. The Commission unanimously approved their final recommendation, that the building appears eligible for local landmark designation. They did amend our requested amendment of the ordinance to require a publicly accessible historic interpretation to be located on the site of the property, which will be included before the item is heard before the Board of Supervisors at a future date. There were a few tenants that spoke, at the hearing and raised some concerns about primarily not the designation, but the change of use of the property. The Planning Code allows for landmark properties with the Showplace Square Area Plan, to convert from PDR zoning to office as-of-right. The concerns again were not over the landmark designation, or over the proposed landmark designation, but the potential change of use. The property owner has applied for a -- to convert the property to an office use. While that conversion is as-of-right because of the size of the property this Commission will hear an office allocation at a future hearing and those items will likely -- those issues will likely be raised before you at that time. That concludes my presentation. If you have any questions, I'd be happy to answer them, thank you.

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: None

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.

6. (K. McGEE: (415) 558-6367)
CENTRAL SOMA ECO-DISTRICT TASK FORCE RECOMMENDATIONS - **Informational Presentation** - In April 2013, the Planning Department convened a Task Force as a means to engage public and private stakeholders to collaborate and advise on the first phase of Eco-District development, District Organization. To achieve success as an Eco-District, a neighborhood - in partnership with the city and other public agencies – must create a shared vision for the area. Engaging public and private stakeholders to work together, share ideas, and establish partnerships for the area is critical. During this informational presentation, members of the Task Force will describe their work and present the Task Force’s recommendations and next steps to create an Eco-District in the Central SoMa plan area.

SPEAKERS: + Bill – Task Force presentation
 + Bob Gamble – Water & energy systems potential
 + Virginia Grande – Community driven initiatives

ACTION: None – Informational

7. (K. HADDADAN: (415) 575-9068)
2013.1674I
ACCESSORY DWELLING UNITS IN THE CASTRO - **Amendments to 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 Assessor 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; and making environmental findings, and findings of consistency with the General Plan, and the eight priority policies of Planning Code, Section 101.1, and directing the Clerk to send a copy of this Ordinance to the California Department of Housing and Community Development in accordance with State law.
 Preliminary Recommendation: Adopt a Recommendation for Approval
 (Continued from Regular Meeting of February 20, 2014)

- SPEAKERS:**
- + Supervisor Wiener – Housing crisis, separate pieces of legislation, this creates new housing
 - + Robin Chang - Would not alter built environment, while adding housing
 - + Katherine Roberts – Hopefully pilot legislation will spread out to the rest of the City
 - + Tim Colen – Inherently affordable housing, with no effect on neighborhood character
 - = Gen Fujiyoka – Potential affordable issues, evictions, Ellis Act evictions
- ACTION:** Adopted a Recommendation for Approval with amendments proposed by staff; adding a recommendation to consult with the City Attorney’s Office regarding the monitoring requirement
- AYES:** Wu, Fong, Antonini, Borden, Hillis, Moore, Sugaya
- MOTION:** 19099

10. [2013.1137C](#) (M. SMITH: (415) 558.6322)
 4054 24TH STREET - north side between Castro and Noe Streets, Lot 017 in Assessor’s Block 3656 - **Request for Conditional Use Authorization**, pursuant to Planning Code Section 303, to enlarge an existing bar use (d.b.a Valley Tavern) by creating outdoor seating within the rear yard of the property. The outdoor area would measure approximately 1,112.5 square-feet. Including the proposed outdoor space, the overall bar use would measure 2,837.5 square-feet of occupied floor area. Seating within the rear yard would include but is not limited to eight bench seats and four tables to accommodate 24 patrons. The project requires conditional use authorization for the expansion of an existing bar use (Section 728.41), to create an outdoor seating area within the rear yard (Section 728.24), and to create a use that is more than 2,499 square-feet (Section 728.21). The subject property is located within the 24th Street/ Noe Valley Neighborhood Commercial District and 40-X Height and Bulk District. This action constitutes the Approval Action for the project for purposes of CEQA, pursuant to Section 31.04(h) of the San Francisco Administrative Code.
 Preliminary Recommendation: Approve with Conditions

- SPEAKERS:**
- + Henry Karnilowicz – Project description
 - + Vince Hogan – Proprietor presentation
 - + Monica McCaughnaly – Neighbor support
 - + Patrick McCaughnaly – Important Noe Valley amenity
 - + Michael Newfeld – Neighbor support, neighborhood amenity
 - + Marilla Heskala – Where neighborhood meets?
 - + Todd David – Full support, urban village
 - + Adam Rouge – Patio was a great part of the community
 - + Matt Ward – Lovely part of the City
 - + Rick Maroney – No noise issue
 - + ___ Patrick – works at the Valley Tavern
 - + David Casstianus – Church bell ringer, fabric of the neighborhood
 - + Nich O’Neil – Public meeting place
 - + Sean Maloney – Community participant, garden a quiet place
 - + Randy Knox – Garden a quiet place, owner sensitive to the neighborhood
 - + Pat Buskovich – Needs to do some acoustical work, but great open space, noisy neighborhood
 - Mark Hunter – Public nuisance, noise can be dramatic, deny the request
 - Shoshana Liebner – Reverberating sound, be respectful

- Ellen Ridgeway – Noise effects on children
 - Daniel Wineberg – Only a problem when there a lot of people
 - = Erik Rattse – Okay, if mitigation measures implemented
- ACTION: Approved with Conditions as amended, striking Item 3 under the Noise Section
 AYES: Wu, Fong, Antonini, Borden, Hillis, Moore, Sugaya
 MOTION: 19100

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.

- 11a. [2013.0179DV](#) (M. SMITH: (415) 558-6322)
3660 21st STREET - north side between Church and Sanchez Streets; Lot 019 in Assessor's Block 3605 - **Request for Discretionary Review** of Building Permit Application No. 2013.03.29.3348 proposing to remove both garages at the front of the property and reconstruct a new two-car garage at the east side of the front of the lot, infill the light well on the west side of the building, construct an addition at the east side of the building, and construct a two-story addition at the front of the building with a minimal increase in the height of the building. The project has been determined to be tantamount to demolition but it was administratively approved by the Zoning Administrator pursuant to case No. 2013.0179D because it has a value greater than at least 80% of the combined land and structure values of single-family homes in San Francisco. The project also requires variances from the Planning Code for rear yard, front setback, and garage door width. The property is located within a RH-1 (Residential, House, One-Family) District, the Dolores Height Special Use District, and 40-X Height and Bulk District.
 Staff Analysis: Full Review
 Preliminary Recommendation: Do not take Discretionary Review and Approve

- SPEAKERS:
- Sue Hestor – DR Requestor representative
 - Arran Pera – Do not want them to build over the non-complying portion
 - Wendy Ticewhalner – Building enlargement east, loss of view
 - Tom Doug – Pre-application performed off-site. Take the deck off
 - Angus Pera – Public view corridor
 - Peggy Kline – SUD restrictions, concern over precedence of variances
 - + Alice Barkely – Project description
 - + Chris Cox – Property owner
 - + Tom Chandler – Tom & Jerry Christmas' Tree. House not opposed
 - + Jerry Goldstein - Tom & Jerry Christmas' Tree. House not opposed. Love not war, peace and harmony
 - + Bridgette Shenck – Response to questions
- ACTION: No DR; Approved as proposed
 AYES: Wu, Fong, Antonini, Borden, Hillis, Moore, Sugaya
 DRA No: 0353

- 11b. [2013.0179DV](#) (M. SMITH: (415) 558-6322)
 3660 21st STREET - north side between Church and Sanchez Streets; Lot 019 in Assessor's Block 3605 - **Request for front setback, rear yard, and garage door width variances** pursuant to Sections 132, 134, and 144 of the Planning Code respectively for Building Permit Application No. 2013.03.29.3348 proposing to remove both garages at the front of the property and reconstruct a new two-car garage at the east side of the front of the lot, infill the light well on the west side of the building, construct an addition at the east side of the building, and construct a two-story addition at the front of the building with a minimal increase in the height of the building. The project has been determined to be tantamount to demolition but it was administratively approved by the Zoning Administrator pursuant to case No. 2013.0179D because it has a value greater than at least 80% of the combined land and structure values of single-family homes in San Francisco. The property is located within a RH-1 (Residential, House, One-Family) District, the Dolores Height Special Use District, and 40-X Height and Bulk District.

- SPEAKERS: - Sue Hestor – DR Requestor representative
 - Aaron Pera – Do not want them to build over the non-complying portion
 - Wendy Ticewhalner – Building enlargement east, loss of view
 - Tom Doug – Pre-application performed off-site. Take the deck off
 - Angus Pera – Public view corridor
 - Peggy Kline – SUD restrictions, concern over precedence of variances
 + Alice Barkely – Project description
 + Chris Cox – Property owner
 + Tom Chanlder – Tom & Jerry Christmas’ Tree. House not opposed
 + Jerry Goldstein - Tom & Jerry Christmas’ Tree. House not opposed. Love not war, peace and harmony
 + Bridgette Shemck – Response to questions
- ACTION: Acting ZA closed the PH and took the matter under advisement

- 12a. [2013.1001DV](#) (C. NOEL: (415) 575-9125)
 1072-1074 SANCHEZ STREET - west side of Sanchez Street between 24th and Elizabeth streets; Lot 004 in Assessor’s Block 3654 - **Mandatory Discretionary Review**, pursuant to Planning Code Section 317, of Building Permit Application No. 2013.1021.9769, proposing to reconfigure the existing three-unit building to a two-unit building. The property is located within a RH-3 (Residential, House Three-Family) Zoning District and 40-X Height and Bulk District. This action constitutes the Approval Action for the project for purposes of CEQA, pursuant to Section 31.04(h) of the San Francisco Administrative Code.
 Preliminary Recommendation: Do Not Take Discretionary Review and Approve
NOTE: After hearing and closing public comment, the matter was continued to February 6, 2014 by a vote of +6 -0 (Fong absent).
 (Continued from Regular Meeting of February 6, 2014)

- SPEAKERS: + Bonnie Bridges – Project description
 + Sunh Cho - Owner
- ACTION: Took DR and denied the merger
- AYES: Wu, Borden, Hillis, Moore, Sugaya
- NAYES: Fong, Antonini,
- DRA No: 0354

- 12b. [2013.1001DV](#) (C. NOEL: (415) 575-9125)
1072-1074 SANCHEZ STREET - west side of Sanchez Street between 24th and Elizabeth Streets; Lot 004 in Assessor's Block 3654 - **Request for a Rear Yard Variance**, pursuant to Planning Code Sections 134 to replace a rear staircase with a third floor balcony and second floor landing at the rear of the dwelling, as well as, a horizontal addition/infill at the rear of the dwelling on the first and second floors at the southwest elevation. The property is located within a RH-3 (Residential, House Three-Family) Zoning District and 40-X Height and Bulk District.
 (Continued from Regular Meeting of February 6, 2014)

SPEAKERS: + Bonnie Bridges – Project description
 + Sunh Cho - Owner
 ACTION: Acting ZA closed the PH and took the matter under advisement

H. 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))

None

ADJOURNMENT – 5:18 P.M.

