



CONDITIONAL USE AUTHORIZATION APPEAL

1310 JUNIPERO SERRA BLVD

Date: April 21, 2025
To: Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board of Supervisors
From: Rich Hillis, Planning Director – Planning Department (628) 652-7600
Kurt Botn, Case Planner – Planning Department (628) 652-7311

Re: **Board File No. 250280, Planning Case No. 2023-007010APL-02**
Appeal of Conditional Use Authorization for 1310 Junipero Serra Blvd

Hearing Date: April 29, 2025
Project Sponsor: Daniel Robinson, Maccraken Robinson Architecture, 479 Ninth Street, 2nd Floor, San Francisco, CA 94103
Appellants: David Joy, 3214 Irving Street, San Francisco, CA 94122

Introduction

This memorandum and the attached documents are a response to the letters of appeal to the Board of Supervisors (“Board”) regarding the Planning Commission’s (“Commission”) approval of the application for Conditional Use Authorization under Planning Department Case Number 2023-007010APL-02 pursuant to Planning Code Sections:

- 209.1 (Residential-House),
- 303 (Conditional Use Authorization).

This memorandum addresses the appeal to the Board, filed on March 17, 2025, by David Joy.

The decision before the Board is whether to uphold, overturn, or amend the Planning Commission’s approval of an application for Conditional Use Authorization to allow the proposed Project at the subject property.

Project Description. The proposal is for the construction of a one-story 23-foot-tall accessory maintenance and facility building for the San Francisco Golf Club (approximately 19,100 gross square feet.) The building will house administration offices for the maintenance staff, a repair shop for maintenance of vehicles and

equipment, mowers, golf cart, staff break room and lockers/bathrooms. Additionally, the Project will include a parking lot located to the west of the maintenance facility consisting of 23 parking spaces.

Site Description & Present Use. The Project Site, west of Interstate-280, is located at the north side of the San Francisco Golf Club (an existing open recreation area) between Thomas Moore Way and Brotherhood way in the Lakeshore neighborhood west of the Ocean View neighborhood, surrounded by RH-1 (D) Zoning Districts. The Project Site (Lot 036 in Assessor's Block 7380) is one component of a larger open recreation area site, the San Francisco Golf Club, at 1310 Junipero Serra Boulevard on (Lot's 005,034 and 036 in Assessor's Block 7380). The total site is approximately 164 acres with an existing club house and golfing area (d.b.a. San Francisco Golf Club) which was established in 1915.

Surrounding Properties and Neighborhood. The Project Site is located within the RH-1 (D) Zoning Districts. The immediate context is mixed in character with residential and institutional uses. The immediate neighborhood includes two-to-three-story residential development to the east, St Thomas More Catholic School and Congregation Am Tikvah to the North, an Alma Via of San Francisco an assisted living facility to the east. The south portion of the project site is located next to the City of Daly City jurisdiction.

Background

- On April 25, 2024, at the request of Supervisor Melgar's office, the project was continued to May 23rd, 2024, hearing date to allow the project sponsor to conduct additional outreach to the adjacent St Thomas More School.
- On May 14th, 2024, the project sponsor requested continuance to the June 13th, 2024, hearing date to continue outreach to the St Thomas Moore School.
- On June 5th, 2024, the project sponsor requested continuance to the August 1st, 2024, hearing date.
- On July 17th, 2024, the project sponsor requested continuance to the October 17th, 2024, hearing date.
- On October 17th, 2024, due to opposition from members of the public, the Planning Commission suggested alternative locations for the proposed project. The project was continued to the January 9th, 2025, hearing date.
- On December 20th, 2024, the project sponsor requested continuance to the February 13th, 2025, hearing date to continue outreach and communication to the St Thomas Moore School and community.
- On February 11th, 2024, a virtual community meeting was conducted. The meeting allowed the Project Sponsor to answer questions and concerns from parents and members of the community opposed to the project prior to the hearing date.
- On February 13, 2025, the Commission conducted a duly noticed public hearing at a regularly scheduled meeting on Conditional Use Authorization Application No. 2023-007010CUA and approved the Project by issuing Motion No. 21685.

Conditional Use Authorization Requirements

Planning Code Section 303 establishes criteria for the Commission to consider when reviewing all applications for Conditional Use approval. To approve the project, the Commission must find that these criteria have been met:

1. That the proposed use or feature, at the size and intensity contemplated and at the proposed location, will provide a development that is necessary or desirable for, and compatible with, the neighborhood or the community; and
2. That such use or feature as proposed will not be detrimental to the health, safety, convenience or general welfare of persons residing or working in the vicinity, or injurious to property, improvements or potential development in the vicinity, with respect to aspects including but not limited to the following:
 - a. The nature of the proposed site, including its size and shape, and the proposed size, shape and arrangement of structures;
 - b. 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;
 - c. The safeguards afforded to prevent noxious or offensive emissions such as noise, glare, dust and odor;
 - d. Treatment given, as appropriate, to such aspects as landscaping, screening, open spaces, parking and loading areas, service areas, lighting and signs; and
3. That such use or feature as proposed will comply with the applicable provisions of this Code and will not adversely affect the General Plan.
4. That such use or feature as proposed will provide development that is in conformity with the stated purpose of the applicable Use District.

Appellant Issues and Planning Department Responses

ISSUE 1: The Planning Department failed to seriously take into account the health and safety of school children being the closest neighbors. See Title 5, Article 2, Section M (APPENDIX 1) b. They failed to elicit competent testimony from health professionals and SFFD experts before approval was granted.

RESPONSE 1: The Planning Department takes community concerns about health and safety—especially those involving school children—very seriously.

In this case, the proposed project was reviewed and found to qualify for a Class 32 Categorical Exemption under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), which applies to infill development projects in

urbanized areas that meet specific criteria related to environmental impacts. This determination was issued in a Letter of Determination on November 16, 2022 (Record No. 2022-005447ZAD).

The project was also classified as an Open Recreation Area under Planning Code Section 102 and required a Conditional Use Authorization under Planning Code Section 209.1. While this process does not specifically require testimony from health professionals or the San Francisco Fire Department, other agencies—including the Department of Building Inspection and Fire Department—may still review applicable safety standards as part of project permitting.

ISSUE 2: There is no mention of lithium-ion batteries being stored or charged yet there are 63 vehicle stalls shown on the latest set of drawings which are presently powered by mixed fuels (diesel, gas or battery) that will ultimately run on lithium-ion batteries.

RESPONSE 2: The submitted floor plans reflect the general use of the space, but they do not include technical details such as electrical or charging infrastructure. These components fall outside of Planning's scope and are instead reviewed by the Department of Building Inspection (DBI) under the Electrical Code. DBI will ensure that all electrical systems meet stringent safety standards before a building permit is issued.

In addition, the project is subject to the Maher Ordinance (Article 22A of the Health Code), administered by the Department of Public Health. This ordinance requires an environmental site assessment and ensures safe handling of hazardous materials, including those associated with batteries.

ISSUE 3: The existing site is described as 109-acre size lot but under site description is listed as 164 acres.

RESPONSE 3: The San Francisco Golf Club is spread over 3 lots including lot 5, lot 34 and lot 36 on Assessor's block 3650. The project is proposed on lot 36 and is approximately 109 acres.

ISSUE 4: We have been advised by an architect that the LOD (Letter of Determination) is non-binding and that the municipal definitions of "facade, front" in Sec 102 says, "where a lot has more than one frontage on rights of way, all such frontages shall be considered front facades except where a facade meets the definition of "Rear Facade". Considering the December 1, 2023, memo San Francisco Planning Department employees, in cooperation with the project sponsor, all but eliminated the only public, paved thoroughfare adjacent to the property. Thomas More Way is the only road maintained by SFMTA, SF Street Cleaning Department, and is the primary access for two schools, the church, Alma Via Senior Living, and even the golf club. It is our contention that Thomas More Way should be considered as the primary frontage.

As to the front entry and rear yard to the proposed building, it appears that the front entries are on Golf Course Road. Doesn't that then make the rear yard the area between the school and the back of the proposed building? Per Planning Code Section 134, that requires a minimum rear yard depth of 30% of the total depth of the lot along the entire rear of the building.

RESPONSE 4: The Planning Department recognizes that frontage determinations on unusually shaped lots can be a point of confusion and concern, especially when public access and neighborhood character are at stake.

In this case, the project sponsor submitted a formal Letter of Determination (LOD No. 2022-005447ZAD) to request clarification on lot frontage and setback requirements. The Department reviewed this request and, under Planning Code Sections 101.1, 172(b), 173(b), and 307, the Zoning Administrator determined the applicable lot frontage.

Because the lot is irregular in shape and does not have traditional street-facing frontage, the Zoning Administrator relied on existing interpretation practices that prioritize continuity with the surrounding block pattern and the locations of primary building access. Although Thomas More Way provides public access and serves nearby institutions, it is a narrow extension that offers limited street frontage to this particular property. Most development in the area fronts on Brotherhood Way or Junipero Serra Blvd, and the existing structures on the project site are primarily accessed from the eastern side. Furthermore, even if Thomas More Way was used as the front of the property it would not prohibit the building's proposed siting.

Based on this analysis, the frontage was determined to be the eastern property line that abuts City-owned parcels on Block 7380 (Lots 027, 028, and 029). This determination guides how setback and rear yard requirements are applied.

Regarding the rear yard: Planning Code Section 134 does require a minimum 30% depth for rear yards, based on the designated rear lot line. With the eastern side established as the frontage, the Department evaluated the project's layout accordingly and found it to be compliant with rear yard requirements under current Planning Code definitions and interpretations.

ISSUE 5: Conditional Use Findings.

RESPONSE 5: The Project has been designed to be in keeping and scale with other properties in the neighborhood. The new building is located within the buildable area of the lot. After feedback from the community and the Planning Commission the project sponsor revised the original proposal that proposed a setback of approximately 20 feet to revise the project to include a 40 feet setback from the property line that is adjacent to the St. Thomas More School. The building has a height of 23 feet at the building's front and is within the maximum height permitted in the 40-X Height and Bulk District, which is in compliance with the Planning Code. The Project complies with all relevant requirements and standards of the Planning Code.

ISSUE 6: General Plan Compliance.

RESPONSE 6: The Conditional Use Authorization was based on the legal land use of the subject property. Open recreation area is permitted with a Conditional Use Authorization within the RH-1 (D) Zoning District pursuant to Planning Code Section 209.1. The letter of Determination issued by the Zoning Administrator on November 16th, 2022, determined the current golf course falls within the definition of an Open Recreation Area defined in Planning Code Section 102. The Project provides a use that is compatible with

the existing open recreational uses that are permitted in the RH-1 (D) Zoning District with a Conditional Use Authorization.

ISSUE 7: Fire Safety and Egress.

RESPONSE 7: While specific fire safety requirements are regulated under the San Francisco Building and Fire Codes, the Planning Commission acknowledged the importance of this issue during the February 13, 2025, hearing. As a result, they added a condition of approval specifically requiring a review of fire safety and egress at the fence line.

Planning Staff will coordinate with the project sponsor and the Department of Building Inspection during the Building Permit review process to ensure this condition is thoroughly addressed. The City's permitting system requires that all projects meet current life safety standards before construction can proceed.

ISSUE 8: Dust Mitigation.

RESPONSE 8: The Planning Department recognizes that dust generated during construction can have real impacts on air quality, health, and quality of life—particularly for nearby schools and residents.

Dust mitigation requirements are enforced by the Department of Public Health (DPH) and the Department of Building Inspection under the City's Dust Control Ordinance (Article 22B of the Health Code). As part of this process, the project sponsor will be required to submit a site-specific Dust Control Plan to DPH for review and approval before any construction begins.

In addition, the Planning Commission added a specific condition of approval on February 13, 2025, directing Planning Staff to coordinate with DPH on enhanced dust mitigation measures. Planning Staff will continue to work with the sponsor and relevant agencies to ensure these measures are implemented during the Building Permit review process.

Summary Response

In summary, the subject application was presented to the Planning Commission with supporting information outlined in Motion No. 21685. Prior to the hearing, Planning staff and members of the Commission conducted site visits to the project location and the adjacent St. Thomas More School to better understand the context.

Planning staff also conducted outreach to school staff and organized a virtual community meeting with representatives from St. Thomas More School, the SF Golf Design Team, and concerned members of the public. This meeting provided an opportunity for the project sponsor to hear directly from the community, particularly regarding concerns about the project's proximity to the school and its potential impact on students.

After considering public input, staff analysis, and applicable land use regulations, the Planning Commission evaluated the proposal in the context of the RH-1(D) Zoning District and the General Plan.

The Commission ultimately found that the project was consistent with the objectives and policies of the General Plan and met all required Planning Code findings.

Conclusion

For the reasons stated in this document, in the attached Resolution, and in the Planning Department case file, the Planning Department recommends that the Board uphold the Planning Commission's decision in approving the Conditional Use authorization for the Project.