

1 [Findings for the Tentative/Parcel Subdivision Map Appeal for 692-696 De Haro Street.]

2

3 **Motion adopting findings related to the appeal of the decision of the Director of Public**  
4 **Works approving a Tentative/Parcel Map to legalize a proposed subdivision creating**  
5 **three lots in Assessor Block 4031, Lot 26, at 692-696 De Haro Street.**

6

7 The appellants, Barry and Barbara Deutsch, through their attorney, Christopher Cole,  
8 filed a timely appeal on April 6, 2001, protesting the March 28, 2001, decision of the Director  
9 of Public Works approving a proposed Tentative/Parcel Map to legalize a proposed  
10 subdivision creating three lots in Assessor's Block 4031, Lot 26, at 692-696 De Haro Street.

11 The public hearing before the Board of Supervisors on said appeal was scheduled for  
12 April 23, 2001. On April 23, 2001, the Board of Supervisors conducted a duly noticed hearing  
13 on the appeal from the approval of the Tentative/Parcel Map.

14 In reviewing the appeal of the approval of the requested Tentative/Parcel Map, the  
15 Board of Supervisors reviewed and considered the written record before the Board, including,  
16 but not limited to, the project's negative declaration, adopted pursuant to the California  
17 Environmental Quality Act, and all of the public comments made in support of and opposed to  
18 the appeal.

19 NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT MOVED, That the Board of Supervisors of the City and  
20 County of San Francisco hereby finds that:

21 1. Pursuant to the California Subdivision Map Act (Government Code Sections 66410  
22 et seq.), including Section 66474 (a)-(d), and based upon substantial evidence in the record  
23 before this Board and in the files of the Department of Public Works and the City Planning  
24 Department, the Map is not consistent with the San Francisco General Plan, and the design or  
25 improvement of the proposed subdivision is not consistent with the San Francisco General

1 Plan. Specifically, the Board determines that the Map and its affect on the existing historic on-  
2 site structure are inconsistent with the General Plan, including, without limitation, the following  
3 enumerated policies:

4 a. Urban Design Element, Objective 2 (conservation of resources which provide  
5 a sense of nature, continuity with the past, and freedom from overcrowding), in particular  
6 Policy 4 (preserve notable landmarks and areas of historic, architectural or aesthetic value,  
7 and promote the preservation of other buildings and features that provide continuity with past  
8 development).

9 b. Recreation and Open Space Element, Objective 2 (develop and maintain a  
10 diversified and balanced citywide system of high quality public open space), Policy 13  
11 (preserve and protect significant natural resource areas).

12 c. Environmental Protection Element, Objective 8 (ensure the protection of plant  
13 and animal life in the City), Policy 2 (protect the habitats of known plant and animal species  
14 that require a relatively natural environment).

15 2. That this Board finds that the proposed tentative/parcel map is inconsistent with the  
16 Priority Policies of the San Francisco General Plan, as set forth in Planning Code Section  
17 101.1. In particular, the proposed tentative/parcel map is inconsistent with Section  
18 101.1(b)(2) (conservation and protection of existing housing and neighborhood character) and  
19 101.1(b)(3) (preservation and enhancement of the City's supply of affordable housing).

20 FURTHER MOVED, That the Board of Supervisors, on April 30, 2001, after carefully  
21 balancing the competing public and private interests, disapproved the decision of the Director  
22 of Public Works on March 28, 2001, and disapproved the proposed Tentative/Parcel Map  
23 which would have legalized a proposed subdivision creating three lots in Assessor's Block  
24 4031, Lot 26, at 692-696 De Haro Street.

25