

BOARD of SUPERVISORS



City Hall
Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco 94102-4689
Tel. No. 554-5184
Fax No. 554-5163
TDD/TTY No. 554-5227

MEMORANDUM

LAND USE AND TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE

SAN FRANCISCO BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

TO: Supervisor Mark Farrell, Chair
Land Use and Transportation Committee

FROM: Victor Young, Assistant Clerk *VY*

DATE: March 7, 2017

SUBJECT: **COMMITTEE REPORT, BOARD MEETING**
Tuesday, March 6, 2017

The following file should be presented as a **COMMITTEE REPORT** at the Board meeting, Tuesday, March 7, 2017. This item was acted upon at the Committee Meeting on Monday, March 6, 2017, at 1:30 p.m., by the votes indicated.

Item No. 44 **File No. 170002**

Ordinance amending the Commerce and Industry Element of the General Plan to update the guidelines regarding overconcentration of Eating and Drinking Establishments in a single area; affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act; and making findings of consistency with the General Plan, and the eight priority policies of Planning Code, Section 101.1.

RECOMMENDED AS A COMMITTEE REPORT

Vote: Supervisor Mark Farrell - Aye
Supervisor Aaron Peskin - No
Supervisor Katy Tang - Aye

c: Board of Supervisors
Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board
Jon Givner, Deputy City Attorney

File No. 170002

Committee Item No. 2

Board Item No. 44

COMMITTEE/BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

AGENDA PACKET CONTENTS LIST

Committee: Land Use and Transportation

Date March 6, 2017

Board of Supervisors Meeting

Date 3/7/17

Cmte Board

- | | | |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Motion |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Resolution |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Ordinance |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Legislative Digest |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Budget and Legislative Analyst Report |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Youth Commission Report |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Introduction Form |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Department/Agency Cover Letter and/or Report |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Grant Information Form |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Grant Budget |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Subcontract Budget |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Contract/Agreement |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Form 126 - Ethics Commission |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Award Letter |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Application |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Form 700 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Vacancy Notice |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Information Sheet |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Public Correspondence |

OTHER

(Use back side if additional space is needed)

- | | | |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <u>CEDA Determination</u> |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <u>Planning Commission Resolution No. 19003</u> |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <u>Notice of Public Hearing</u> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | _____ |

Completed by: Alisa Somera

Date March 2, 2017

Completed by: V Young

Date 3/7/17

1 [General Plan Amendment - Commerce and Industry Element; Guidelines for Eating and
2 Drinking Establishments]

3 **Ordinance amending the Commerce and Industry Element of the General Plan to**
4 **update the guidelines regarding overconcentration of Eating and Drinking**
5 **Establishments in a single area; affirming the Planning Department's determination**
6 **under the California Environmental Quality Act; and making findings of consistency**
7 **with the General Plan, and the eight priority policies of Planning Code, Section 101.1.**

8 NOTE: **Unchanged Code text and uncodified text** are in plain Arial font.
9 **Additions to Codes** are in *single-underline italics Times New Roman font*.
10 **Deletions to Codes** are in *strikethrough italics Times New Roman font*.
11 **Board amendment additions** are in double-underlined Arial font.
12 **Board amendment deletions** are in ~~strikethrough Arial font~~.
13 **Asterisks (* * * *)** indicate the omission of unchanged Code
14 subsections or parts of tables.

15 Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

16 Section 1. Findings.

17 (a) The Planning Department has determined that the actions contemplated in this
18 ordinance comply with the California Environmental Quality Act (California Public Resources
19 Code Sections 21000 et seq.). Said determination is on file with the Clerk of the Board of
20 Supervisors in File No. 170002 and is incorporated herein by reference. The Board affirms
21 this determination.

22 (b) On December 1, 2016, the Planning Commission, in Resolution No. 19803,
23 adopted findings that the actions contemplated in this ordinance are consistent with the City's
24 General Plan and the eight priority policies of Planning Code Section 101.1. The Board of
25 Supervisors adopts these findings as its own. A copy of said Resolution is on file with the
Clerk of the Board of Supervisors in File No. 170002, and is incorporated herein by reference.

1 (c) Charter Section 4.105 and Planning Code Section 340 provide that the Planning
2 Commission shall periodically recommend to the Board of Supervisors, for approval or
3 rejection, proposed amendments to the General Plan in response to changing conditions.

4 (d) Pursuant to Planning Code Section 340, an amendment to the General Plan
5 may be initiated by a resolution of intention by the Planning Commission referring to, and
6 incorporating by reference, the proposed General Plan amendment. The Planning
7 Commission shall adopt the proposed General Plan amendment if, after a public hearing, it
8 finds from the facts presented that the public necessity, convenience and general welfare
9 require the proposed amendment or any part thereof. If adopted by the Commission, in whole
10 or in part, the proposed amendment shall be presented to the Board of Supervisors, which
11 may approve or reject the amendment by a majority vote.

12 (e) The Commerce and Industry Element sets forth objectives and policies
13 addressing the broad range of economic activities, facilities and support systems that
14 constitute San Francisco's employment and service base. The Guidelines for Specific Uses
15 contained in the Neighborhood Commerce section states that "[t]he balance of commercial
16 uses may be threatened when eating and drinking establishments occupy more than 20% of
17 the total occupied commercial frontage," with a higher percentage of 25% for districts such as
18 North Beach where there is an established pattern of service to a broad market.

19 (f) Planning Code Section 303(o) states that the existing concentration of eating
20 and drinking uses in an area should not exceed 25% of the total commercial frontage within
21 300 feet of the establishment and within the same zoning district.

22 (g) Because there is specific language in the Planning Code regarding
23 concentration of eating and drinking uses in an area, the proposed amendments to the
24 General Plan will replace the existing specific language in the Guidelines with general policy
25 statements regarding the impacts of clustering.

1 (h) At a public hearing held on June 30, 2016, the Planning Commission adopted a
2 Resolution of Intention to initiate the proposed amendment to the General Plan in order to
3 update the Commerce and Industry Element. At a public hearing held on December 1, 2016,
4 the Commission adopted Resolution No. 19803, finding that the proposed General Plan
5 amendment serves the public necessity, convenience and general welfare and recommending
6 the amendment to the Board of Supervisors.

7 (i) In a letter dated December 22, 2016, the Planning Department transmitted to the
8 Board of Supervisors the proposed General Plan amendment and the Planning Commission's
9 adoption actions. The Board received this transmittal on December 22, 2016, and it is on file
10 with the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors in File No. 170002.

11 (j) The Board of Supervisors finds, pursuant to Planning Code Section 340, that the
12 proposed General Plan amendment will serve the public necessity, convenience and general
13 welfare for the reasons set forth in Planning Commission Resolution No. 19803 and
14 incorporates those reasons herein by reference.

15
16 Section 2. The General Plan is hereby amended by revising the text of the Commerce
17 and Industry Element, to read as follows:

18 **Neighborhood Commerce**

19 **Objective 6**

20 **Maintain and Strengthen Viable Neighborhood Commercial Areas Easily Accessible to**
21 **City Residents.**

22 * * * *

1 **POLICY 6.1**

2 Ensure and encourage the retention and provision of neighborhood-serving goods and
3 services in the city's neighborhood commercial districts, while recognizing and encouraging
4 diversity among the districts.

5 * * * *

6 **GUIDELINES FOR SPECIFIC USES**

7 * * * *

8 **Eating and Drinking Uses**

9 * * * *

10 In districts where the proliferation of eating and drinking establishments could generate
11 problems, the following guidelines should be employed in the consideration of new
12 establishments, relocations, changes from one kind of eating and drinking establishment to
13 another (e.g. from self-service restaurant to full-service restaurant), expansion or
14 intensification of existing establishments:

- 15 • The establishment should not add to an overconcentration of eating and drinking
16 establishments in a single district. The balance of commercial uses may be threatened
17 when eating and drinking establishments occupy ~~more than 20% of the total occupied an~~
18 overconcentration of commercial frontage. Proposals for eating and drinking
19 establishments which would increase the proportion of total occupied commercial
20 frontage above ~~20%~~ what is prescribed in the Planning Code should be reviewed to ensure
21 that they would not reduce the variety of neighborhood-serving uses; nor create
22 substantial noise, traffic, parking problems, or other nuisances in the district or
23 surrounding neighborhood. ~~Those establishments that would do the above should not be~~
24 ~~permitted. Except in districts with an established pattern of service to a broad market, such as~~
25 ~~North Beach, such establishments should not occupy more than 25% of the total commercially-~~

1 *occupied frontage in a district. To minimize the problems they can create, eating and drinking*
2 *uses should generally be at least 100 feet apart from each other, unless there are factors making*
3 *clustering of uses appropriate. For example, a configuration of clustered eating and drinking*
4 *uses where off-street parking is shared might be more appropriate than an even distribution of*
5 *such establishments.*


6 * * * *

7
8 Section 3. Effective Date. This ordinance shall become effective 30 days after
9 enactment. Enactment occurs when the Mayor signs the ordinance, the Mayor returns the
10 ordinance unsigned or does not sign the ordinance within ten days of receiving it, or the Board
11 of Supervisors overrides the Mayor's veto of the ordinance.

12
13 Section 4. Scope of Ordinance. In enacting this ordinance, the Board of Supervisors
14 intends to amend only those words, phrases, paragraphs, subsections, sections, articles,
15 numbers, punctuation marks, charts, diagrams, or any other constituent parts of the General
16 Plan that are explicitly shown in this ordinance as additions, deletions, Board amendment
17 additions, and Board amendment deletions in accordance with the "Note" that appears under
18 the official title of the ordinance.

19
20 APPROVED AS TO FORM:
21 DENNIS J. HERRERA, City Attorney

22
23 By:


24 JUDITH A. BOYAJIAN
Deputy City Attorney

n:\leganalas2016\1600772\01157175.docx

LEGISLATIVE DIGEST

[General Plan Amendment - Commerce and Industry Element; Guidelines for Eating and Drinking Establishments]

Ordinance amending the Commerce and Industry Element of the General Plan to update the guidelines regarding overconcentration of Eating and Drinking Establishments in a single area; affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act; and making findings of consistency with the General Plan, and the eight priority policies of Planning Code, Section 101.1.

Existing Law

The Commerce and Industry Element of the City's General Plan states that (1) the balance of commercial uses may be threatened when eating and drinking establishments occupy more than 20% of the total occupied commercial frontage of a single zoning district and (2) eating and drinking establishments should not occupy more than 25% of the total commercially-occupied frontage in zoning districts with an established pattern of service to a broad market.

Planning Code Section 303 establishes a specific percentage limit for eating and drinking uses when such a use is seeking a Conditional Use authorization. Subsection (o) provides that such uses should not exceed 25% of the total commercial frontage in the same zoning district within 300 feet of the proposed establishment.

Amendments to Current Law

The General Plan would be amended to (1) delete the specific percentages of eating and drinking establishments that can occupy total occupied commercial frontages in a single zoning district and (2) modify the language in the Guidelines for Eating and Drinking Establishments to reflect a general policy statement. Pursuant to Planning Code Section 303(o), Planning staff would continue to calculate the percentage of total commercial frontage within 300 feet of an establishment requesting a Conditional Use authorization but would no longer also have to calculate whether eating and drinking establishments occupy more than 20% of the total occupied commercial frontage of the zoning district.

Background Information

As the primary policy document for the City's land use, the General Plan should contain general policy statements and goals. Specific requirements are more appropriately in the Planning Code. The current General Plan language confuses the complementary but different roles of the General Plan and the Planning Code, and requires planners to make two similar but distinct calculations for a specific project. In addition, the calculation prescribed in the General Plan does not meet the intent of the requirement, which is to look at the surrounding area for an overconcentration of eating and drinking uses. Simplifying the language in the


FILE NO. 170002

General Plan so that it reflects a general policy while leaving in place the specific requirements of the Planning Code would ensure a more effective and consistent evaluation of eating and drinking uses.

Planning Code Section 340 describes the process for amending the City's General Plan. Pursuant to subsection (d), a proposed amendment to the General Plan must be presented to the Board of Supervisors together with a copy of the Planning Commission's resolution of adoption. The Board may approve or reject the amendment by a majority vote. If the Board of Supervisors fails to act within 90 days of receipt, the amendment is deemed approved.

n:\legana\as2016\1600772\01158933.docx

BOARD of SUPERVISORS



City Hall
Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco 94102-4689
Tel. No. 554-5184
Fax No. 554-5163
TDD/TTY No. 554-5227

January 17, 2017

File No. 170002

Lisa Gibson
Acting Environmental Review Officer
Planning Department
1650 Mission Street, Ste. 400
San Francisco, CA 94103

Dear Ms. Gibson:


On January 10, 2017, the Planning Commission introduced the following proposed legislation:

File No. 170002

Ordinance amending the Commerce and Industry Element of the General Plan to update the guidelines regarding overconcentration of Eating and Drinking Establishments in a single area; affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act; and making findings of consistency with the General Plan, and the eight priority policies of Planning Code, Section 101.1.

This legislation is being transmitted to you for environmental review.

Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board

for By:  Alisa Somera, Legislative Deputy Director
Land Use and Transportation Committee

Attachment

c: Joy Navarrete, Environmental Planning
Jeanie Poling, Environmental Planning

Not defined as a project under CEQA Sections 15378 and 15060(c)(2) because it does not result in a physical change in the environment.

Joy
Navarrete

Digitally signed by Joy Navarrete
DN: cn=Joy Navarrete, o=Planning,
ou=Environmental Planning,
email=joy.navarrete@sfgov.org,
c=US
Date: 2017.01.19 13:48:57 -08'00'



**SAN FRANCISCO
PLANNING DEPARTMENT**

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO

2016 DEC 22 PM 2:20

BY *ZB*

December 22, 2016

Ms. Angela Calvillo, Clerk
Board of Supervisors
City and County of San Francisco
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102

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

Reception:
415.558.6378

Fax:
415.558.6409

Planning
Information:
415.558.6377

Re: Transmittal of Planning Department Case Number 2015-017206GPA:
Updating the Commerce and Industry Element on Eating and Drinking
Establishments
Board File No. TBD
Planning Commission Recommendation: Approval with Modification

Dear Ms. Calvillo,

On December 1, 2016, the Planning Commission conducted duly noticed public hearings at regularly scheduled meetings to consider the proposed Ordinance, initiated by the Planning Commission that would amend the General Plan's Commerce and Industry Element's Guidelines for Specific Uses on Eating and Drinking Establishments. The proposed changes are designed to reflect a general policy statement by removing the specific percentages of eating and drinking establishments that can occupy total occupied commercial frontages in a single zoning district. At the hearing the Planning Commission voted to recommend approval with modifications.

The Commission proposed modification, which has already been incorporated into the ordinance, is as follows:

- Remove the following sentence from the General Plan's Commerce and Industry Element's Guidelines for Specific Uses on Eating and Drinking Establishments, found on Page 4, Lines 23-24: "Those establishments that would do the above should not be permitted."

The proposed amendments are not defined as a project under CEQA Guidelines Section 15060(c) and 15378 because they do not result in a physical change in the environment.

Please note that per Planning Code Section 340, if the Board of Supervisors fails to act within 90 days of receipt of a General Plan amendment, the amendment shall be deemed approved. The Board of Supervisors may approve or reject such amendment by a majority vote.

Please find attached documents relating to the actions of the Commission. A redlined version of this ordinance along with two copies will be delivered to your office following this transmittal. If you have any questions or require further information please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,



Aaron D. Starr
Manager of Legislative Affairs

cc:

Judy Boyajian Deputy City Attorney
Alisa Somera, Office of the Clerk of the Board
John Carroll, Office of the Clerk of the Board

Attachments :

Planning Commission Resolution
Planning Department Executive Summary



SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Planning Commission Resolution No. 19803

HEARING DATE: DECEMBER 1, 2016

Case No. 2015-017206GPA
Project Name: Updating the Commerce and Industry Element on Eating and
Drinking Establishments
Adoption Hearing
Staff Contact: Aaron Starr, Manager Legislative Affairs
aaron.starr@sfgov.org; 415-558-6362

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

Reception:
415.558.6378

Fax:
415.558.6409

Planning
Information:
415.558.6377

RECOMMENDING THAT THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS ADOPT A PROPOSED ORDINANCE THAT WOULD AMEND THE GENERAL PLAN TO UPDATE THE COMMERCE AND INDUSTRY ELEMENT OF THE GENERAL PLAN TO UPDATE THE GUIDELINES REGARDING OVERCONCENTRATION OF EATING AND DRINKING ESTABLISHMENTS IN A SINGLE AREA; AFFIRMING THE PLANNING DEPARTMENT'S DETERMINATION UNDER THE CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT; AND MAKING FINDINGS OF CONSISTENCY WITH THE GENERAL PLAN AND THE EIGHT PRIORITY POLICIES OF PLANNING CODE SECTION 101.1.

WHEREAS, Section 4.105 of the Charter of the City and County of San Francisco mandates that the Planning Department shall periodically recommend to the Board of Supervisors for approval or rejection proposed amendments to the General Plan; and

WHEREAS, on June 30, 2016 the Planning Commission voted to initiate the proposed Ordinance; and

WHEREAS, The Planning Commission (hereinafter "Commission") conducted a duly noticed public hearing at a regularly scheduled meeting to consider the proposed Ordinance on December 1, 2016; and,

WHEREAS, the proposed amendments are not defined as a project under CEQA Guidelines Section 15060(c)(2) and 15378 because they do not result in a physical change in the environment; and

WHEREAS, the Planning 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 Department staff and other interested parties; and

WHEREAS, all pertinent documents may be found in the files of the Department, as the custodian of records, at 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission has reviewed the proposed Ordinance; and

MOVED, that the Planning Commission hereby recommends that the Board of Supervisors approve with modifications the proposed ordinance. The Commission's proposed Modification is as follows:

- Remove the following sentence from the General Plan's Commerce and Industry Element's Guidelines for Specific Uses on Eating and Drinking Establishments, found on Page 4, Lines 23-24: "Those establishments that would do the above should not be permitted."

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 Planning Commission finds that as the main policy document for the City's land use, the General Plan should focus on general policy statements, while the Planning Code should provide the tools for implementing those goals and policies. The Planning Commission supports the proposed amendments because they will remove specific numeric controls from the General Plan and maintain similar, but more effective controls in the Planning Code.
2. The Planning Commission finds that the current language confuses the roll of the two documents by having specific numerical controls in the General Plan and requires planners to make two similar but distinct calculations. Additionally, the calculation prescribed in the General Plan does not meet the intent of the language, which is to look at the surround area for a concentration of eating and drinking uses.
3. The Planning Commission finds that simplifying the language in the General Plan ensures that the intent is still being met because no changes are proposed regarding the Conditional Use. This will ensure a more effective and consistent evaluation of eating and drinking uses in the future.
4. **General Plan Compliance.** The proposed Ordinance is consistent with the following Objectives and Policies of the General Plan:

COMMERCE AND INDUSTRY ELEMENT

OBJECTIVE 1

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

Policy 1.2

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

The General Plan Amendments will continue to provide guidance on the balance of eating and drinking uses for neighborhood commerce.

OBJECTIVE 6

MAINTAIN AND STRENGTHEN VIABLE NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL AREAS EASILY ACCESSIBLE TO CITY RESIDENTS

Policy 6.1

Ensure and encourage the retention and provision of neighborhood-serving goods and services in the city's neighborhood commercial districts, while recognizing and encouraging diversity among the districts.

The General Plan Amendments will continue to provide guidance on the balance of eating and drinking uses for neighborhood commerce.

HOUSING ELEMENT

OBJECTIVE 11

SUPPORT AND RESPECT THE DIVERSE AND DISTINCT CHARACTER OF SAN FRANCISCO'S NEIGHBORHOODS.

Policy 11.8

Consider a neighborhood's character when integrating new uses, and minimize disruption caused by expansion of institutions into residential areas.

The General Plan Amendments will provide guidance on the balance of eating and drinking uses for neighborhood commerce.

5. **Planning Code Section 101 Findings.** The proposed amendments to the Planning Code are consistent with the eight Priority Policies set forth in Section 101.1(b) of the Planning Code in that:

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

The General Plan Amendments to the Commerce and Industry Element would continue preserve and enhance existing neighborhood retail opportunities.

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

The General Plan Amendments to the Commerce and Industry Element would continue preserve and enhance existing neighborhood retail opportunities.

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

The General Plan Amendments would not impact the City's supply of affordable housing be preserved and enhanced.

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

The General Plan Amendments would not impede MUNI transit service or overburden our streets or neighborhood parking.

5. 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 General Plan Amendments would not adversely affect the industrial or service sectors or impede future opportunities for resident employment and ownership in the industrial or service sectors.

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

The General Plan Amendments would not adversely impact the City's ability to achieve the greatest possible preparedness to protect against injury and loss of life in an earthquake.

7. That the landmarks and historic buildings be preserved;

The General Plan Amendments would no impact the preservation of landmarks and historic buildings.


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

The General Plan Amendments would not impact the City's parks and open space and their access to sunlight and vistas from development.

6. **Planning Code Section 302 Findings.** The Planning Commission finds from the facts presented that the public necessity, convenience and general welfare require the proposed amendments to the Planning Code as set forth in Section 302.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Commission hereby recommends that the Board ADOPT the proposed Ordinance described in this Resolution.

I hereby certify that the foregoing Resolution was adopted by the Commission at its meeting on December 1, 2016.



Jonas P. Ionin
Commission Secretary

AYES: Fong, Hillis, Johnson, Koppel, Melgar, and Richards

NOES: Moore

ABSENT: None

ADOPTED: December 1, 2016



SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Executive Summary General Plan Text Amendment

HEARING DATE: DECEMBER 1, 2016
CONTINUED FROM OCTOBER 6, 2016

Date: November 23, 2016
Case No. 2015-017206GPA
Project Name: Updating the Commerce and Industry Element on Eating and Drinking Establishments
Staff Contact: Aaron Starr, Manager Legislative Affairs
aaron.starr@sfgov.org; 415-558-6362
Recommendation: Recommend Approval

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

Reception:
415.558.6378

Fax:
415.558.6409

Planning
Information:
415.558.6377

GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT

The proposal would amend the General Plan's Commerce and Industry Element's Guidelines for Specific Uses on Eating and Drinking Establishments. The proposed changes are designed to reflect a general policy statement by removing the specific percentages of eating and drinking establishments that can occupy total occupied commercial frontages in a single zoning district. The specific percentage calculations for eating and drinking use concentrations will remain unchanged in Planning Code Section 303 (o).

The Way It Is Now:

1. The Commerce and Industry Element of the General Plan states that the balance of commercial uses may be threatened when eating and drinking establishments occupy more than 20% of the total occupied commercial frontage of a single zoning district. Additionally, eating and drinking establishments should not occupy more than 25% of the total commercially-occupied frontage in "zoning districts with an established pattern of service to a broad market, such as North Beach."
2. The Commerce and Industry Element of the General Plan includes the following language: *"Except in districts with an established pattern of service to a broad market, such as North Beach, such establishments should not occupy more than 25% of the total commercially-occupied frontage in a district. To minimize the problems they can create, eating and drinking uses should generally be at least 100 feet apart from each other, unless there are factors making clustering of uses appropriate. For example, a configuration of clustered eating and drinking uses where off-street parking is shared might be more appropriate than an even distribution of such establishments."*
3. Planning Code section 303, which governs Conditional Uses, also establishes a specific percentage limit for eating and drinking uses when such uses are seeking Conditional Use Authorization. Section 303(o) states that such proposed uses should not exceed 25% of the total commercial frontage in the same zoning district within 300 feet of the establishment.

The Way It Would Be:

1. The specific percentages of eating and drinking establishments that can occupy total occupied commercial frontages in a single zoning district would be removed in the General Plan. The language in the Guidelines for Eating and Drinking Establishments would be amended to reflect a general policy statement.
2. The language identified in "The Way It Is Now" section above under item #2 would be deleted.
3. There will be no change in the current Planning Code calculations in Section 303(o). Planning staff would continue to calculate the percentage of total commercial frontage within 300 feet of the proposed establishment. Planners would no longer have to calculate the percentage in the General Plan, which requires that eating and drinking establishments should not occupy more than 20 percent of the total occupied commercial frontage.

BACKGROUND

This item was continued from the October 6, 2016 hearing. The Commission asked Staff to work with the Telegraph Hill Dwellers (THD) who had some concerns around the proposed General Plan Amendment, specifically the following language:

The balance of commercial uses may be threatened when eating and drinking establishments occupy ~~more than 20% of the total occupied~~ a high percentage of commercial frontage.

Except in districts with an established pattern of service to a broad market, such as North Beach, such establishments could occupy a higher percentage than other commercial districts should not occupy more than 25% of the total commercially-occupied frontage in a district.

Staff met with the Stan Hayes on October 24, 2016 to discuss THD's concerns regarding the proposed language. In response to THD's concerns, Staff suggested changing "a high percentage" to "an overconcentration of" since that better reflects what the intention behind what this section of the General Plan is trying to address. Staff also suggested removing the paragraph that described North Beach in detail rather than including the language "could occupy a higher percentage than other commercial districts." This was done so that no individual NCD was singled out, and allows North Beach to adjust their controls in the future as the neighborhood's needs change. While not stating support or opposition to the proposed language, Mr. Hayes reiterated that it was important to THD that a percentage remains in the General Plan. Staff reiterated that the General Plan should state an overall vision for the City, and that the details and specific numeric controls should only reside in the Planning Code.

The language below is based on Staff's meeting with Mr. Hayes and has been integrated in to the Ordinance before the Commissions today. The new edits to the General Plan cue the public to an overall vision for neighborhood commercial districts: that Eating and Drinking establishments do not reduce the variety of neighborhood serving uses or create substantial noise, traffic, or other nuisances in a district or neighborhood. Furthermore, the edits to the ordinance reference the Planning Code, which does have a specific percentage detailed in Section 303(o).

The establishment should not add to an overconcentration of eating and drinking establishments in a single district. The balance of commercial uses may be threatened when eating and drinking establishments occupy *more than 20% of the total occupied an overconcentration of* commercial frontage. Proposals for eating and drinking establishments which would increase the proportion of total occupied commercial frontage above *20% what is prescribed in the Planning Code* should be reviewed to ensure that they would not reduce the variety of neighborhood-serving uses; nor create substantial noise, traffic, parking problems, or other nuisances in the district or surrounding neighborhood. Those establishments that would do the above should not be permitted. *Except in districts with an established pattern of service to a broad market, such as North Beach, such establishments should not occupy more than 25% of the total commercially occupied frontage in a district. To minimize the problems they can create, eating and drinking uses should generally be at least 100 feet apart from each other, unless there are factors making clustering of uses appropriate. For example, a configuration of clustered eating and drinking uses where off-street parking is shared might be more appropriate than an even distribution of such establishments.*

The General Plan

San Francisco's General Plan is a guiding document that is designed to attain the following goals:

- Protection, preservation, and enhancement of the economic, social, cultural, and esthetic values that establish the desirable quality and unique character of the city;
- Improvement of the city as a place for living, by aiding in making it more healthful, safe, pleasant, and satisfying, with housing representing good standards for all residents and by providing adequate open spaces and appropriate community facilities;
- Improvement of the city as a place for commerce and industry by making it more efficient, orderly, and satisfactory for the production, exchange and distribution of goods and services, with adequate space for each type of economic activity and improved facilities for the loading and movement of goods;
- Coordination of the varied pattern of land use with public and semi-public service facilities required for efficient functioning of the city, and for the convenience and well-being of its residents, workers, and visitors; and
- Coordination of the varied pattern of land use with circulation routes and facilities required for the efficient movement of people and goods within the city, and to and from the city.

The General Plan is as a broad policy document that the Planning Code interprets. As such specific numerical limits should not be located within the General Plan; they should be located within the Planning Code. Currently the language in the Commerce and Industry Element is very specific by requiring that establishments do not occupy more than 20% of the total occupied commercial frontage in a single district. The Commerce and Industry Element describes the percentage as a method to mitigate the proliferation of eating and drinking establishments in any one district. The element also describes characteristics of eating and drinking establishments namely, that they should not impose undue traffic or noise impacts.

The Conditional Use Authorization (CUA) in section 303 also includes specific findings around noise, traffic patterns, and neighborhood compatibility which interpret the language in the General Plan.

The 2011 Restaurant Ordinance

In 2012 the Board passed The Restaurant Rationalization ordinance (Board File 120084), which among things rationalized the City's restaurant definitions and controls. Prior to this ordinance there were 13 separate eating and drinking definition in the Planning Code. The Restaurant Rationalization ordinance

reduced this number down to three definitions based on level of alcohol service: Bars, Restaurants, Limited Restaurants. Also as part of this ordinance, the Planning Department added Planning Code Section 303(p) - now Section 303(o) - which imported the concentration controls for eating and drinking uses from the General Plan into the Planning Code. The higher percentage - 25% - was used and instead of the entire NC District a radius of 300 feet was used to address NCDs that can stretch for several miles. At the time, it was anticipated that the Restaurant Rationalization ordinance would be followed-up with a General Plan amendment to remove the concentration controls in the General Plan. While several years late, this ordinance accomplishes this goal.

The controls that were put into Planning Code Section 303 in 2012 and which exist today are as follows:

Eating and Drinking Uses. With regard to a Conditional Use authorization application for a Restaurant, Limited-Restaurant and Bar uses the Planning Commission shall consider, in addition to the criteria set forth in Subsection (c) above, the existing concentration of eating and drinking uses in the area. Such concentration should not exceed 25 percent of the total commercial frontage as measured in linear feet within the immediate area of the subject site. For the purposes of this Section of the Code, the immediate area shall be defined as all properties located within 300' of the subject property and also located within the same zoning district.

Note that the 25% threshold in section 303(o) is a finding that the Planning Commission considers. Some Conditional Use applications for Eating and Drinking Uses exceed the 25% threshold described in the Code due to site circumstances, neighborhood support, or other reasons.

ISSUES AND CONSIDERATIONS

Duplicative Controls

Currently, two similar but distinct calculations for General Plan and Planning Code Compliance for proposed Eating and Drinking Uses that are subject to a Conditional Use Authorization are required of Planning Staff.

Calculation One:

The Planning Code calculation is explicitly done within 300 feet of the proposed site. This calculation can easily be done by Planning Staff by way of a simple survey of the immediate area of the proposed establishment. As such, this calculation meets the intent of the General Plan, ensuring there is not an overconcentration of such uses within the immediate vicinity.

Calculation Two

The General Plan calculation establishes that the proposed establishment will not add more than 20% (or 25% "in districts with an established pattern of service to a broad market") of eating and drinking establishments to the overall occupied commercial frontages of the *entire* zoning district.

The two calculations can be onerous on staff and the calculation that is the most informative resides in the Planning Code.

One Metric

The Planning Code implements the intent of the General Plan using a narrower geography. In using the entire district the General Plan calculation disregards the immediate blocks of the site-unlike the Planning Code calculation-and can in fact be less restrictive since there could be a cluster of eating and drinking establishments of greater than 20-25% near a proposed site, but district-wide be less than a 20% concentration. It is not clear in the General Plan guideline how to interpret a district with an "established pattern of service to a broad market," which uses a 25% threshold. The Planning Code simplifies and standardizes the use concentration threshold to 25% within 300 feet if the proposed establishment city-wide.

RECOMMENDATION

The Department recommends that the Commission recommend *approval* of the proposed Ordinance and adopt the attached Draft Resolution to that effect.

BASIS FOR RECOMMENDATION

The Planning Department supports the proposed amendments because they will remove specific numeric controls from the General Plan and maintain similar, but more effective controls in the Planning Code. As the main policy document for the City's land use, the General Plan should focus on general policy statements, while the Planning Code should provide the tools for implementing those goals and policies.

The current language confuses the roll of the two documents by having specific numerical controls in the General Plan and requires planners to make two similar but distinct calculations. Additionally, the calculation prescribed in the General Plan does not meet the intent of the language, which is to look at the surround area for a concentration of eating and drinking uses.

Simplifying the language in the General Plan ensures that the intent is still being met because no changes are proposed regarding the Conditional Use. This will ensure a more effective and consistent evaluation of eating and drinking uses in the future.

REQUIRED COMMISSION ACTION

The proposed Ordinance is before the Commission so that it may recommend adoption, rejection, or adoption with modifications to the Board of Supervisors.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

The proposed amendments are not defined as a project under CEQA Guidelines Section 15060(c)(2) and 15378 because they do not result in a physical change in the environment.

PUBLIC COMMENT

On May 9, 2016 the Planning Department hosted a meeting regarding the proposed change to the General Plan, attendance was low. Since the initiation hearing on June 30th, the Department presented at the July 19 meeting of the Coalition of San Francisco Neighborhoods to describe the changes to the General Plan, and they provided no substantial comments. Additionally, the Department presented the proposed changes to the Small Business Commission on August 22, 2016; commission members had no substantial

comments. Staff has also met with the Golden Gate Restaurant Association which is supportive of the change.

At the October 6, 2016 hearing the Commission heard public comment from THD, who stated concern about the proposed language in the General Plan Amendment, and that proposed amendments to the General Plan should be continued and considered along with pending changes to Article 7 of the Planning Code. In response to the first concern, Staff met with Stan Hayes of the THD on October 24, 2016. The result of that meeting is discussed under the Background section found on Page 2 of this report. In response to the second concern, the Article 7 Reorganization Project is a separate piece of legislation that has no impact on the General Plan because it is in fact a reorganization of the Planning Code. It also has no impact on the Conditional Use findings in 303 (o) for Eating and Drinking Establishments. These are two separate efforts and need not be considered together.

RECOMMENDATION: Recommend Approval

Attachments:

1. Exhibit A: Draft Resolution
2. Exhibit B: Public Comment
3. Exhibit C: Ordinance Adopting General Plan Amendments



SAN FRANCISCO

OFFICE OF SMALL BUSINESS

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
EDWIN M. LEE, MAYOR

OFFICE OF SMALL BUSINESS
REGINA DICK-ENDRIZZI, DIRECTOR

March 3, 2017

Ms. Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board
City Hall Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

RE: BOS File No. 170002 [General Plan Amendment - Commerce and Industry Element; Guidelines for Eating and Drinking Establishments]

Small Business Commission Recommendation to the Board of Supervisors: **Approval**

Dear Ms. Calvillo,

On February 27, 2017, the Small Business Commission voted (6-0, 1 absent) to recommend that the Board of Supervisors approve BOS File No. 170002.

The legislation removes specific restaurant concentration controls from the General Plan, thereby eliminating a redundant calculation. It also allows adjustment of concentration levels to fit the needs of neighborhoods. The Commission views the legislation as a logical clean-up that appropriately retains specific numerical controls only in the Planning Code.

Thank you for considering the Commission's comments. Please feel free to contact me should you have any questions.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Regina Dick-Endrizzi", written in a cursive style.

Regina Dick-Endrizzi
Director, Office of Small Business

cc: John Rahaim, Planning Department
Aaron Starr, Planning Department
Nicole Elliott, Mayor's Office
Mawuli Tugbenyoh, Mayor's Office
Lisa Pagan, Office of Economic and Workforce Development
Alisa Somera, Land Use & Transportation Committee

OFFICE OF SMALL BUSINESS • SMALL BUSINESS COMMISSION
1 DR. CARLTON B. GOODLETT PLACE, ROOM 110, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94102-4681
(415) 554-6408

San Francisco Planning Department Updating Commerce and Industry Element



SAN FRANCISCO
PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Land Use Committee
March 6, 2016

Role of the General Plan

- The GP is City's "constitution," which sets goals and policy that are the basis for City's land-use decisions.
- A general plan is required by the State of California.
- City Charter and Board adoption make it official policy of City and County, mandatory, not just advisory.
- Changes can only be initiated by Commission, but the Board and Mayor have final approval.

The General Plan is the embodiment of the community's vision for the future of San Francisco.



Role of the Planning Code

- Planning Code is the City's land use implementation document.
- The PC contains specific controls (such as numeric controls) that are intended to implement the vision outlined in the General Plan.
- The Planning Code must be consistent with the General Plan.
- The Board, Mayor, or Planning Commission can initiate changes to the Planning Code.

"To guide, control and regulate future growth and development in accordance with the General Plan of the City and County of San Francisco"
[Section 101, Planning Code]



Proposed Changes

- Update would amend Neighborhood Commerce section of the Commerce and industry Element.
- The proposed changes would remove specific numeric controls for restaurant concentration from the GP...

The balance of commercial uses may be threatened when eating and drinking establishments occupy ~~more than 20% of the total occupied~~ an overconcentration of commercial frontage.

Proposals for eating and drinking establishments which would increase the proportion of total occupied commercial frontage above 20% what is prescribed in the Planning Code should be reviewed..."



Proposed Changes

- ...and also language that calls out specific neighborhoods for greater concentration and overly prescriptive spacing requirements (text below is proposed for deletion);

“Those establishments that would do the above should not be permitted. Except in districts with an established pattern of service to a broad market, such as North Beach, such establishments should not occupy more than 25% of the total commercially-occupied frontage in a district. To minimize the problems they can create, eating and drinking uses should generally be at least 100 feet apart from each other, unless there are factors making clustering of uses appropriate”



Proposed Changes

- However similar numeric controls in the Planning Code would remain, where they can be adjusted to better respond to concerns of individual neighborhoods.

For Conditional Use authorization for Eating and Drinking uses, *“the Planning Commission shall consider... the existing concentration of eating and drinking uses in the area. **Such concentration should not exceed 25 percent of the total commercial frontage as measured in linear feet within the immediate area of the subject site.**”*

*For the purposes of this Section of the Code, the immediate area shall be defined as all properties **located within 300' of the subject property** and also located within the same zoning district.*



Implementation Impacts

- Planners would still evaluate the concentration of Eating and Drinking uses for CU applications.
- Instead of 20 and 25%, only 25% would be used.
- Instead of evaluating the concentration of the entire district, which is called out in the GP, only the concentration within 300' would be calculated.
- Concentration levels would still only be used to inform the Department's recommendation and Planning Commission's decision. Other CU findings, public support or opposition, and other factors will still be used in evaluating CU applications.



Commission Action & Outreach

- Planning Commission recommended Approval on December 1, 2016
- The Small Business Commission recommended approval on February 27, 2017
- General Outreach Meeting on May 9, 2016.
- Staff attended CFSN membership meeting on July 19, 2016. No significant comment.
- Reached out to Golden Gate Restaurant Association. Generally supportive.
- Met with rep from Telegraph Hill Dwellers on October 24, 2016. Would prefer to keep the specific % in the GP.








Summary

- Reinforces the role of each document: General Plan as policy document and the Planning Code as implementation document.
- Allows concentration levels to be adjusted to fit the needs of individual neighborhoods (Calle 24 for example), if needed.
- Provides a more meaningful metric for concentration levels, and ensure that eating and drinking uses are more evenly distributed through the District.
- Eliminates the need for Planning Staff to survey the entire NC District in order to provide the overall concentration numbers.




SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT



Questions?

BOARD of SUPERVISORS



City Hall
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco 94102-4689
Tel. No. 554-5184
Fax No. 554-5163
TDD/TTY No. 554-5227

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO LAND USE AND TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN THAT the Land Use and Transportation Committee will hold a public hearing to consider the following proposal and said public hearing will be held as follows, at which time all interested parties may attend and be heard:


Date: Monday, March 6, 2017

Time: 1:30 p.m.

Location: Legislative Chamber, Room 250, located at City Hall
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, San Francisco, CA

Subject: **File No. 170002.** Ordinance amending the Commerce and Industry Element of the General Plan to update the guidelines regarding overconcentration of Eating and Drinking Establishments in a single area; affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act; and making findings of consistency with the General Plan, and the eight priority policies of Planning Code, Section 101.1.

In accordance with Administrative Code, Section 67.7-1, persons who are unable to attend the hearing on this matter may submit written comments to the City prior to the time the hearing begins. These comments will be made part of the official public record in this matter, and shall be brought to the attention of the members of the Committee. Written comments should be addressed to Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board, City Hall, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244, San Francisco, CA 94102. Information relating to this matter is available in the Office of the Clerk of the Board. Agenda information relating to this matter will be available for public review on Friday, March 3, 2017.


Angela Calvillo
Clerk of the Board

DATED: February 22, 2017
PUBLISHED/POSTED: February 24, 2017

CALIFORNIA NEWSPAPER SERVICE BUREAU

DAILY JOURNAL CORPORATION

Mailing Address : 915 E FIRST ST, LOS ANGELES, CA 90012
Telephone (800) 788-7840 / Fax (800) 464-2839
Visit us @ www.LegalAdstore.com

Alisa Somera
CCSF BD OF SUPERVISORS (OFFICIAL NOTICES)
1 DR CARLTON B GOODLETT PL #244
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102

COPY OF NOTICE

Notice Type: GPN GOVT PUBLIC NOTICE
Ad Description AS - 03.06.17 Land Use - 170002 General Plan

To the right is a copy of the notice you sent to us for publication in the SAN FRANCISCO EXAMINER. Thank you for using our newspaper. Please read this notice carefully and call us with ny corrections. The Proof of Publication will be filed with the County Clerk, if required, and mailed to you after the last date below. Publication date(s) for this notice is (are):

02/24/2017

The charge(s) for this order is as follows. An invoice will be sent after the last date of publication. If you prepaid this order in full, you will not receive an invoice.

EXM# 2979747
NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
LAND USE AND TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE
MONDAY, MARCH 6, 2017 - 1:30 PM
CITY HALL, LEGISLATIVE CHAMBER, ROOM 250
1 DR. CARLTON B. GOODLETT PLACE, SAN FRANCISCO, CA

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN THAT the Land Use and Transportation Committee will hold a public hearing to consider the following proposal and said public hearing will be held as follows, at which time all interested parties may attend and be heard: File No. 170002. Ordinance amending the Commerce and Industry Element of the General Plan to update the guidelines regarding overconcentration of Eating and Drinking Establishments in a single area; affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act; and making findings of consistency with the General Plan, and the eight priority policies of Planning Code, Section 101.1. In accordance with Administrative Code, Section 67.7-1, persons who are unable to attend the hearing on this matter may submit written comments to the City prior to the time the hearing begins. These comments will be made part of the official public record in this matter, and shall be brought to the attention of the members of the Committee. Written comments should be addressed to Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board, City Hall, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244, San Francisco, CA 94102. Information relating to this matter is available in the Office of the Clerk of the Board. Agenda information relating to this matter will be available for public review on Friday, March 3, 2017. - Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board



BOARD of SUPERVISORS



City Hall
Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco 94102-4689
Tel. No. 554-5184
Fax No. 554-5163
TDD/TTY No. 554-5227

January 17, 2017

File No. 170002

Lisa Gibson
Acting Environmental Review Officer
Planning Department
1650 Mission Street, Ste. 400
San Francisco, CA 94103

Dear Ms. Gibson:

On January 10, 2017, the Planning Commission introduced the following proposed legislation:

File No. 170002

Ordinance amending the Commerce and Industry Element of the General Plan to update the guidelines regarding overconcentration of Eating and Drinking Establishments in a single area; affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act; and making findings of consistency with the General Plan, and the eight priority policies of Planning Code, Section 101.1.

This legislation is being transmitted to you for environmental review.

Angela Galvillo, Clerk of the Board

for By:  Alisa Somera, Legislative Deputy Director
Land Use and Transportation Committee

Attachment

c: Joy Navarrete, Environmental Planning
Jeanie Poling, Environmental Planning

BOARD of SUPERVISORS



City Hall
Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco 94102-4689
Tel. No. 554-5184
Fax No. 554-5163
TDD/TTY No. 554-5227

MEMORANDUM

TO: Regina Dick-Endrizzi, Director
Small Business Commission, City Hall, Room 448

FROM: *ell for* Alisa Somera, Legislative Deputy Director
Land Use and Transportation Committee

DATE: January 17, 2017

SUBJECT: REFERRAL FROM BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
Land Use and Transportation Committee

The Board of Supervisors' Land Use and Transportation Committee has received the following legislation, which is being referred to the Small Business Commission for comment and recommendation. The Commission may provide any response it deems appropriate within 12 days from the date of this referral.

File No. 170002

Ordinance amending the Commerce and Industry Element of the General Plan to update the guidelines regarding overconcentration of Eating and Drinking Establishments in a single area; affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act; and making findings of consistency with the General Plan, and the eight priority policies of Planning Code, Section 101.1.

Please return this cover sheet with the Commission's response to me at the Board of Supervisors, City Hall, Room 244, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, San Francisco, CA 94102.


RESPONSE FROM SMALL BUSINESS COMMISSION - Date: _____

No Comment
 Recommendation Attached

Chairperson, Small Business Commission

c: Menaka Mahajan, Small Business Commission

BOARD of SUPERVISORS



City Hall
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco 94102-4689
Tel. No. 554-5184
Fax No. 554-5163
TDD/TTY No. 554-5227

MEMORANDUM

TO: Todd Rufo, Director, Office of Economic and Workforce Development
Tiffany Bohee, Executive Director, Office of Community Investment and
Infrastructure

FROM: *el*
fr Alisa Somera, Legislative Deputy Director
Land Use and Transportation Committee

DATE: January 17, 2017

SUBJECT: LEGISLATION INTRODUCED

The Board of Supervisors' Land Use and Transportation Committee has received the following proposed legislation, introduced by the Planning Commission on January 10, 2017:

File No. 170002

Ordinance amending the Commerce and Industry Element of the General Plan to update the guidelines regarding overconcentration of Eating and Drinking Establishments in a single area; affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act; and making findings of consistency with the General Plan, and the eight priority policies of Planning Code, Section 101.1.

If you have comments or reports to be included with the file, please forward them to me at the Board of Supervisors, City Hall, Room 244, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, San Francisco, CA 94102 or by email at: alisa.somera@sfgov.org.

c: Ken Rich, Office of Economic and Workforce Development
Lisa Pagan, Office of Economic and Workforce Development
Claudia Guerra, Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure

Somera, Alisa (BOS)

170002

From: Moe Jamil <moe@middlepolk.org>
Sent: Sunday, March 05, 2017 10:30 PM
To: Farrell, Mark (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS)
Cc: Somera, Alisa (BOS)
Subject: General Plan Amendment Re Restaurants

Dear Supervisors Farrell, Peskin and Tang,

On behalf on MPNA (Middle Polk Neighborhood Association), I urge you to forward tomorrow's general plan amendment to the full Board of Supervisors with a recommendation NOT to approve.

The story of over concentrations of restaurants has been know for decades in our City. Last month, Bob David of the Golden Gate Valley Neighborhood Association shared his neighborhood's groundbreaking effort in 1976 to get then Board of Supervisor's President and District 2 Supervisor to intervene for Union Street with several Van Ness neighborhood leaders at our monthly meeting. His story was truly moving. At the time, there were 13 restaurants in the pipeline for Union Street. As a result of his groups work and activism - Union Street is capped at 44 restaurants. I have included that control below.

North Beach and Telegraph Hill have worked on similar restrictions to maintain neighborhood serving businesses over restaurants which often can pay much higher rents. Here on Polk Street we are exploring potential new code language for our NCD. Calle 24 will be imposing similar restrictions as well.

These are 4 neighborhoods in a City of many neighborhoods. In a perfect world, each district would have a tailored control. In present reality, every neighborhood does not have the volunteer capacity or same level of engagement on these issues.

That is where the General Plan comes in to be a backstop. We oppose the change to the general plan because we firmly believe that an overall benchmark is crucial for the City and the Planning Department should be viewing each new use against that general benchmark.

We love our restaurants here in San Francisco but lets also show some love from our other businesses. We need a balance of uses in our neighborhoods, let the General Plan do its job of protecting all our neighborhoods by calling out a specific benchmark for neighborhoods to look too.

Lastly, this is simply unnecessary given the host of issues we have to grapple with right now.

Thank you for your consideration of this matter and your continued service to our City.

Moe Jamil
Chair
Middle Polk Neighborhood Association
"We are working to make a great neighborhood even better."

**SPECIFIC PROVISIONS FOR THE UNION STREET
NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL DISTRICT**

<u>Article</u> <u>7</u> Code Section	<u>Other</u> Code Section	<i>Zoning Controls</i>
§ 725.44	§ <u>790.91</u>	<p>UNION STREET RESTAURANTS</p> <p>Boundaries: Applicable to the Union Street Neighborhood Commercial District.</p> <p>Applicability: The following controls apply to new uses as well to significant alterations, modifications, and intensifications of existing uses pursuant to § <u>178(c)</u> of the Planning Code.</p> <p>Controls: The Planning Commission may approve a restaurant if, in addition to meeting the criteria set forth in Section <u>303</u>, (1) the use is located on the ground floor, and (2) the Planning Commission finds that an additional restaurant would not result in a net total of more than 44 Restaurants in the Union Street Neighborhood Commercial District. The Planning Department shall apply <u>Article 7</u> zoning controls for Union Street Restaurants to conditional use authorizations required by Planning Code § <u>178</u>, including but not limited to significant alterations, modifications, and intensifications of use. No new alcoholic beverage license type 47 or 49 shall be permitted in the Union Street NCD. Transfer of an existing license type 47 or 49 from an existing Restaurant located within the Union Street NCD to another Restaurant, new or existing, located within the Union Street NCD is permitted with Conditional Use authorization, consistent with the requirements of Planning Code Section <u>303</u>.</p>

Moe Jamil
Chair
Middle Polk Neighborhood Association
"We are working to make a great neighborhood even better."