

File No. 130084

Committee Item No. 3

Board Item No. _____

COMMITTEE/BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

AGENDA PACKET CONTENTS LIST

Committee: Land Use and Economic Development Date October 21, 2013

Board of Supervisors Meeting Date _____

Cmte Board

- | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Motion |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Resolution |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Ordinance |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Introduction Form |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Department/Agency Cover Letter and/or Report |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Public Correspondence |

OTHER (Use back side if additional space is needed)

- | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <u>Categorical Exemption Stamp, dtd 2/25/13</u> |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <u>Environmental Review Determination, dtd 4/10/13</u> |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <u>Planning Commission Resolution No. 18846</u> |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <u>Police Department Recommendation, dtd 2/2013</u> |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <u>Small Business Commission Recommendation, dtd 4/17/13</u> |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input 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"/> | _____ |

Completed by: Alisa Miller Date October 18, 2013

Completed by: _____ Date _____

1 [Planning Code, Zoning Map - Establishing the Excelsior Outer Mission Street Neighborhood
2 Commercial District]

3 **Ordinance amending the Planning Code to establish the Excelsior Outer Mission Street**
4 **Neighborhood Commercial District (NCD) along Mission Street between Alemany**
5 **Boulevard and the San Francisco-San Mateo County line; repealing the Excelsior**
6 **Alcohol Restricted Use District and adding controls on liquor establishments to the**
7 **new NCD; amending various sections to make conforming and other technical**
8 **changes; amending the Zoning Map to rezone specified properties to the new NCD; and**
9 **making environmental findings, and findings of consistency with the General Plan, and**
10 **the eight priority policies of Planning Code, Section 101.1.**

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

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

19 Section 1. Findings.

20 (a) The Planning Department has determined that the actions contemplated in this
21 ordinance comply with the California Environmental Quality Act (California Public Resources
22 Code Sections 21000 et seq.). Said determination is on file with the Clerk of the Board of
23 Supervisors in File No. 130084 and is incorporated herein by reference.

24 (b) On April 18, 2013, the Planning Commission, in Resolution No. 18846, adopted
25 findings that the actions contemplated in this ordinance are consistent, on balance, with the
City's General Plan and eight priority policies of Planning Code Section 101.1. The Board

1 adopts these findings as its own. A copy of said Resolution is on file with the Clerk of the
2 Board of Supervisors in File No. 130084, and is incorporated herein by reference.

3 (c) This Board finds that these Planning Code amendments are consistent with the
4 General Plan and with the priority policies of Planning Code Section 101.1 for the reasons set
5 forth in Planning Commission Resolution No. 18846, and the Board hereby incorporates such
6 reasons herein by reference.

7
8 Section 2. The Planning Code is hereby amended by adding Section 745.1, to read as
9 follows:

10 **SEC. 745.1. EXCELSIOR OUTER MISSION STREET NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL**
11 **DISTRICT.**

12 *The Excelsior Outer Mission Street Neighborhood Commercial District is located along*
13 *Mission Street between Alemany Boulevard and the San Francisco-San Mateo county line. Outer*
14 *Mission Street is mixed use, combining street-fronting retail businesses on the ground floor and*
15 *housing on upper floors. The range of comparison goods and services offered is varied and often*
16 *includes specialty retail stores, restaurants, and neighborhood-serving offices. The area is transit-*
17 *oriented and the commercial uses serve residents of the area as well as residents and visitors from*
18 *adjacent and other neighborhoods.*

19 *The Excelsior Outer Mission Street Neighborhood Commercial District is intended to provide*
20 *convenience goods and services to the surrounding neighborhoods as well as limited comparison*
21 *shopping goods for a wider market. Housing development in new buildings is encouraged above the*
22 *second story. Existing residential units are protected by limitations on demolitions and upper-story*
23 *conversions. Parking for residential and commercial uses is not required. Buildings range in height,*
24 *with height limits generally allowing up to four stories. Lots vary in size, generally small- or medium-*
25 *sized with some very large parcels.*

SEC. 745. EXCELSIOR OUTER MISSION STREET NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL

DISTRICT ZONING CONTROL TABLE

			<u>Excelsior Outer Mission Street</u>
<u>No.</u>	<u>Zoning Category</u>	<u>§ References</u>	<u>Controls</u>
<u>BUILDING STANDARDS</u>			
<u>745.10</u>	<u>Height and Bulk Limit</u>	<u>§§ 102.12, 105, 106, 250 - 252, 260, 261.1, 263.20, 270, 271</u>	<u>Generally 40-X; see Zoning Map. Height Sculpting on Alleys; § 261.1 Additional 5 feet in height allowed for Ground Floor Active Uses in 40-X and 50-X height districts; § 263.20</u>
<u>745.11</u>	<u>Lot Size [Per Development]</u>	<u>§§ 790.56, 121.1</u>	<u>P up to 9,999 sq. ft.; C 10,000 sq. ft. & above</u>
<u>745.12</u>	<u>Rear Yard</u>	<u>§§ 130, 134, 136</u>	<u>Required at the second story and above: § 134(a)(1)(C)</u>
<u>745.13a</u>	<u>Street Frontage</u>	<u>§ 145.1</u>	<u>Required</u>
<u>745.13b</u>	<u>Street Frontage, Ground Floor Commercial</u>	<u>§ 145.4</u>	<u>Required</u>
<u>745.14</u>	<u>Awning</u>	<u>§ 136.1(a)</u>	<u>P</u>
<u>745.15</u>	<u>Canopy</u>	<u>§ 136.1(b)</u>	<u>P</u>
<u>745.16</u>	<u>Marquee</u>	<u>§ 136.1(c)</u>	<u>P</u>
<u>745.17</u>	<u>Streetscape and Pedestrian Improvements</u>	<u>§ 138.1</u>	<u>Required</u>

COMMERCIAL AND INSTITUTIONAL STANDARDS AND USES

745.20	<u>Floor Area Ratio</u>	§§ 102.9, 102.11, 123	3.6 to 1 § 124 (a) (b)
745.21	<u>Use Size [Non-Residential]</u>	§ 790.130, § 121.2	P up to 5,999 sq. ft.; C 6,000 sq. ft. & above
745.22	<u>Off-Street Parking, Commercial/Institutional</u>	§§ 145.1, 150, 151.1, 153 - 157, 159 - 160, 204.5	None required. Limits set forth in Section 151.1.
745.23	<u>Off-Street Freight Loading</u>	§§ 150, 153 - 155, 204.5, 152, 161(b)	Generally, none required if gross floor area is less than 10,000 sq. ft
745.24	<u>Outdoor Activity Area</u>	§§ 790.70, 145.2(a)	P if located in front; C if located elsewhere
745.25	<u>Drive-Up Facility</u>	§ 790.30	
745.26	<u>Walk-Up Facility</u>	§§ 790.140, 145.2(b)	P if recessed 3 ft.; C if not recessed
745.27	<u>Hours of Operation</u>	§ 790.48	P 6 a.m. - 2 a.m. C 2 a.m. - 6 a.m.
745.30	<u>General Advertising Sign</u>	§§ 262, 602 - 604, 608, 609	
745.31	<u>Business Sign</u>	§§ 262, 602 - 604, 607.1(f)3, 608, 609	P
745.32	<u>Other Signs</u>	§§ 262, 602 - 604, 607.1(c) (d) (g) 608, 609	P

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

<u>No.</u>	<u>Zoning Category</u>	<u>§ References</u>	<u>Outer Mission Street</u>		
			<u>Controls by Story</u>		
		<u>§ 790.118</u>	<u>1st</u>	<u>2nd</u>	<u>3rd+</u>
<u>745.38</u>	<u>Residential Conversion</u>	<u>§ 790.84, 317</u>	<u>C</u>	<u>C</u>	<u>C</u>
<u>745.39</u>	<u>Residential Demolition</u>	<u>§ 790.86, 317</u>	<u>C</u>	<u>C</u>	<u>C</u>
<u>Retail Sales and Services</u>					
<u>745.40</u>	<u>Other Retail Sales and Services</u> <u>[Not Listed Below]</u>	<u>§ 790.102</u>	<u>P #</u>	<u>P #</u>	<u>P #</u>
<u>745.41</u>	<u>Bar</u>	<u>§ 790.22</u>	<u>P</u>	<u>P</u>	
<u>745.43</u>	<u>Limited-Restaurant</u>	<u>§ 790.90</u>	<u>P</u>	<u>P</u>	
<u>745.44</u>	<u>Restaurant</u>	<u>§ 790.91</u>	<u>P</u>	<u>P</u>	
<u>745.45</u>	<u>Liquor Store</u>	<u>§ 790.55</u>	<u>NP #</u>		
<u>745.46</u>	<u>Movie Theater</u>	<u>§ 790.64</u>	<u>P</u>	<u>P</u>	
<u>745.47</u>	<u>Adult Entertainment</u>	<u>§ 790.36</u>	<u>C</u>	<u>C</u>	
<u>745.48</u>	<u>Other Entertainment</u>	<u>§ 790.38</u>	<u>P</u>	<u>P</u>	
<u>745.49</u>	<u>Financial Service</u>	<u>§ 790.110</u>	<u>P</u>	<u>P</u>	
<u>745.50</u>	<u>Limited Financial Service</u>	<u>§ 790.112</u>	<u>P</u>	<u>P</u>	
<u>745.51</u>	<u>Medical Service</u>	<u>§ 790.114</u>	<u>P</u>	<u>P</u>	<u>P</u>
<u>745.52</u>	<u>Personal Service</u>	<u>§ 790.116</u>	<u>P</u>	<u>P</u>	<u>P</u>
<u>745.53</u>	<u>Business or Professional Service</u>	<u>§ 790.108</u>	<u>P</u>	<u>P</u>	<u>P</u>
<u>745.54</u>	<u>Massage Establishment</u>	<u>§ 790.60, § 1900</u> <u>Health Code</u>	<u>C</u>	<u>C</u>	
<u>745.55</u>	<u>Tourist Hotel</u>	<u>§ 790.46</u>	<u>C</u>	<u>C</u>	<u>C</u>

1	<u>745.56</u>	<u>Automobile Parking</u>	<u>§§ 790.8, 156, 158.1,</u>	<u>C</u>		
2			<u>160</u>			
3	<u>745.57</u>	<u>Automobile Gas Station</u>	<u>§ 790.14</u>	<u>C</u>		
4	<u>745.58</u>	<u>Automotive Service Station</u>	<u>§ 790.17</u>	<u>C</u>		
5	<u>745.59</u>	<u>Automotive Repair</u>	<u>§ 790.15</u>	<u>C</u>	<u>C</u>	
6	<u>745.60</u>	<u>Automotive Wash</u>	<u>§ 790.18</u>	<u>C</u>		
7	<u>745.61</u>	<u>Automobile Sale or Rental</u>	<u>§ 790.12</u>	<u>C</u>		
8	<u>745.62</u>	<u>Animal Hospital</u>	<u>§ 790.6</u>	<u>C</u>	<u>C</u>	
9	<u>745.63</u>	<u>Ambulance Service</u>	<u>§ 790.2</u>	<u>C</u>		
10	<u>745.64</u>	<u>Mortuary</u>	<u>§ 790.62</u>	<u>C</u>	<u>C</u>	<u>C</u>
11	<u>745.65</u>	<u>Trade Shop</u>	<u>§ 790.124</u>	<u>P</u>	<u>P</u>	<u>P</u>
12	<u>745.66</u>	<u>Storage</u>	<u>§ 790.117</u>	<u>C</u>	<u>C</u>	<u>C</u>
13	<u>745.68</u>	<u>Fringe Financial Services</u>	<u>§ 790.111</u>	<u>#</u>		
14	<u>745.69</u>	<u>Tobacco Paraphernalia</u>	<u>§ 790.123</u>	<u>C</u>		
15		<u>Establishments</u>				
16	<u>745.69B</u>	<u>Amusement Game Arcade</u>	<u>§ 790.4</u>	<u>C</u>		
17		<u>(Mechanical Amusement</u>				
18		<u>Devices)</u>				
19	<u>745.69C</u>	<u>Neighborhood Agriculture</u>	<u>§ 102.35(a)</u>	<u>P</u>	<u>P</u>	<u>P</u>
20	<u>745.69D</u>	<u>Large-Scale Urban Agriculture</u>	<u>§ 102.35(b)</u>	<u>C</u>	<u>C</u>	<u>C</u>
21	<u>Institutions and Non-Retail Sales and Services</u>					
22	<u>745.70</u>	<u>Administrative Service</u>	<u>§ 790.106</u>	<u>C</u>	<u>C</u>	<u>C</u>
23	<u>745.80</u>	<u>Hospital or Medical Center</u>	<u>§ 790.44</u>	<u>C</u>	<u>C</u>	<u>C</u>
24	<u>745.81</u>	<u>Other Institutions, Large</u>	<u>§ 790.50</u>	<u>P</u>	<u>P</u>	<u>P</u>
25						

1	<u>745.82</u>	<u>Other Institutions, Small</u>	<u>§ 790.51</u>	<u>P</u>	<u>P</u>	<u>P</u>
2	<u>745.83</u>	<u>Public Use</u>	<u>§ 790.80</u>	<u>C</u>	<u>C</u>	<u>C</u>
3	<u>745.84</u>	<u>Medical Cannabis Dispensary</u>	<u>§ 790.141</u>	<u>C #</u>	<u>C #</u>	<u>C #</u>
4	<u>RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES</u>					
5	<u>745.90</u>	<u>Residential Use</u>	<u>§ 790.88</u>	<u>P, except</u>	<u>P</u>	<u>P</u>
6				<u>C for</u>		
7				<u>front-</u>		
8				<u>ages</u>		
9				<u>listed in</u>		
10				<u>145.1</u>		
11				<u>(d)</u>		
12	<u>745.91</u>	<u>Residential Density, Dwelling</u>	<u>§§ 207, 207.1,</u>	<u>Generally, 1 unit per 600 sq. ft.</u>		
13		<u>Units</u>	<u>790.88(a)</u>	<u>lot area</u>		
14	<u>745.92</u>	<u>Residential Density, Group</u>	<u>§§ 207.1, 208,</u>	<u>Generally, 1 bedroom per 210</u>		
15		<u>Housing</u>	<u>790.88(b)</u>	<u>sq. ft. lot area</u>		
16	<u>745.93</u>	<u>Usable Open Space [Per</u>	<u>§§ 135, 136</u>	<u>Generally, either 80 sq. ft. if</u>		
17		<u>Residential Unit]</u>		<u>private, or 100 sq. ft. if</u>		
18				<u>common § 135(d)</u>		
19	<u>745.94</u>	<u>Off-Street Parking, Residential</u>	<u>§§ 145.1, 150, 151.1,</u>	<u>P up to one car for each unit;</u>		
20			<u>153- 157, 159- 160,</u>	<u>NP above</u>		
21			<u>166. 167, 204.5</u>			
22	<u>745.95</u>	<u>Community Residential Parking</u>	<u>§ 790.10, 145.1, 166</u>	<u>C</u>		

1 SPECIFIC PROVISIONS FOR THE EXCELSIOR OUTER MISSION STREET

2 NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL DISTRICT

<u>Article</u>		
<u>7 Code</u>		
<u>Section</u>	<u>Other Code Section</u>	<u>Zoning Controls</u>
§ 745.40	§§ 790.55, 790.102(a), 790.102(b)	<u>OFF-SALE LIQUOR ESTABLISHMENTS</u>
§ 745.45		<u>Boundaries: Excelsior Outer Mission Street</u>
		<u>Neighborhood Commercial District.</u>
		<u>Controls:</u>
		<u>(a) New Liquor Store uses with Type 20 or</u>
		<u>Type 21 ABC licenses are not permitted in the district;</u>
		<u>provided, however, that any use within the District</u>
		<u>with an existing Type 20 or Type 21 ABC license may</u>
		<u>obtain a new license, if required by the ABC, after it</u>
		<u>has been closed temporarily for repair, renovation,</u>
		<u>remodeling, or reconstruction.</u>
		<u>(b) Liquor Store uses may relocate within the</u>
		<u>district with conditional use authorization.</u>
		<u>(c) General Grocery, Specialty Grocery, and</u>
		<u>Liquor Store uses with off-sale alcohol licenses shall</u>
		<u>observe the following good neighbor policies:</u>
		<u>(1) Liquor establishments shall provide outside</u>
		<u>lighting in a manner sufficient to illuminate street and</u>
		<u>sidewalk areas and adjacent parking, as appropriate</u>
		<u>to maintain security, without disturbing area</u>

residences;

(2) Advertisements in windows and clear doors are not permitted, and no more than 25 percent of the square footage of the windows and clear doors of liquor establishments shall bear signage of any sort, and all signage shall be placed and maintained in a manner that ensures that law enforcement personnel have a clear and unobstructed view of the interior of the premises, including the area in which the cash registers are maintained, from the exterior public sidewalk or entrance to the premises.

§ 745.68

§ 249.35

FRINGE FINANCIAL SERVICE RESTRICTED USE DISTRICT (FFSRUD)

Boundaries: The FFSRUD and its ¼ mile buffer includes, but is not limited to, properties within the Excelsior Outer Mission Street Neighborhood Commercial District.

Controls: Within the FFSRUD and its ¼ mile buffer, fringe financial services are NP pursuant to Section 249.35. Outside the FFSRUD and its ¼ mile buffer, fringe financial services are P subject to the restrictions set forth in Section 249.35(c)(3).

§ 745.84

Health Code § 3308

MEDICAL CANNABIS DISPENSARIES

§ 790.141

Boundaries: Excelsior Outer Mission Street Neighborhood Commercial District

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

		<p><u>Controls:</u></p> <p><u>(a) A Medical Cannabis Dispensary (MCD) seeking to locate within 500 feet of another MCD use may be allowed as a conditional use; provided, however, that any amendments to regulations governing the proximity of an MCD to another MCD that are applicable to MCDs Citywide shall apply in the Excelsior Outer Mission NCD and will supersede the conditional use requirement contained in this Section 745.</u></p> <p><u>(b) In addition to the requirements of Planning Code Section 303, the Planning Commission shall approve the application and authorize the conditional use if the facts presented are such to establish that:</u></p> <p><u>(1) the MCD will bring measurable community benefits and enhancements to the Excelsior Outer Mission Street Neighborhood Commercial District,</u></p> <p><u>(2) the MCD has prepared a parking and transportation management plan sufficient to address the anticipated impact of its patients,</u></p> <p><u>(3) the MCD has demonstrated a commitment to maintaining public safety by actively engaging with the community prior to applying for the Conditional Use, including adequate security measures in the operation of their business and designating a</u></p>
--	--	--

1 community liaison to deal effectively with current and
2 future neighborhood concerns.

3 (c) In addition to the above criteria, in regard
4 to a Conditional Use authorization application, the
5 Planning Commission shall consider the existing
6 concentrations of MCDs within the District.

7 (d) A Medical Cannabis Dispensary may only
8 operate between the hours of 8 am and 10 pm.

9 (e) A Medical Cannabis Dispensary may
10 locate above the first floor only if it shall be accessible
11 to persons with disabilities as required under the
12 California Building Code.

13
14 Section 3. The Planning Code is hereby amended by deleting Section 785, as follows:

15 ~~**SEC. 785. EXCELSIOR ALCOHOL RESTRICTED USE DISTRICT.**~~

16 ~~*(a) Findings. There are an unusually large number of establishments dispensing alcoholic*~~
17 ~~*beverages, including beer and wine, for off-site consumption in the area located generally on Mission*~~
18 ~~*Street from Silver Avenue to the Daly City border. The existence of this many off-sale alcoholic*~~
19 ~~*beverage establishments appears to contribute directly to numerous peace, health, safety, and general*~~
20 ~~*welfare problems in the area, including loitering, littering, public drunkenness, defacement and*~~
21 ~~*damaging of structures, pedestrian obstructions, as well as traffic circulation, parking and noise*~~
22 ~~*problems on public streets and neighborhood lots. The existence of these problems creates serious*~~
23 ~~*impacts on the health, safety, and welfare of residents of nearby single and multiple family areas,*~~
24 ~~*including fear for the safety of children, elderly residents, and visitors to the area. The problems also*~~
25 ~~*contribute to the deterioration of the neighborhood and concomitant devaluation of property and*~~

1 ~~destruction of community values and quality of life. The number of establishments selling alcoholic~~
2 ~~beverages for off-site consumption and the associated problems discourage more desirable and needed~~
3 ~~commercial uses in the area.~~

4 ~~(b) Establishment of the Excelsior Alcohol Restricted Use District. In order to preserve the~~
5 ~~residential character and the neighborhood serving commercial uses of the area, the Excelsior Alcohol~~
6 ~~Restricted Use District (Excelsior Alcohol RUD) is hereby established for the blocks and lots fronting~~
7 ~~both sides of Mission Street from Silver Avenue to the Daly City border, as set forth on Sectional Maps~~
8 ~~SU 11 and SU 12 of the Zoning Maps of the City and County of San Francisco.~~

9 ~~(c) Definitions. The following definitions shall apply to this Section 785:~~

10 ~~(1) "ABC License" shall mean a liquor license issued by the California Department of~~
11 ~~Alcoholic Beverage Control.~~

12 ~~(2) "Liquor establishment" shall mean any enterprise selling alcoholic beverages, as~~
13 ~~defined in California Business and Professions Code Sections 23004 and 23025, pursuant to an ABC~~
14 ~~License.~~

15 ~~(3) "Prohibited liquor establishment" shall mean any establishment selling alcoholic~~
16 ~~beverages lawfully existing prior to the effective date of this ordinance and licensed by the State of~~
17 ~~California for the sale of alcoholic beverages for off-site consumption ("off sale"), so long as otherwise~~
18 ~~lawful. It shall include an establishment that is defined in Section 790.55 of this Code.~~

19 ~~(d) Controls:~~

20 ~~(1) No new liquor establishments selling alcoholic beverages for off-site consumption~~
21 ~~shall be permitted in the Excelsior Alcohol RUD.~~

22 ~~(2) The prohibition of off-sale liquor establishments shall not be interpreted to prohibit~~
23 ~~the following:~~

24 ~~(A) Temporary uses, as described in Planning Code Section 205.1 or 205.3; or~~
25

1 ~~(B) Establishment of an off-sale liquor establishment if an application for such~~
2 ~~liquor establishment is on file with the California Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control prior to~~
3 ~~the effective date of this ordinance establishing the Excelsior Alcohol RUD; or~~

4 ~~(3) Continuation of Existing Prohibited Liquor Establishments. In the Excelsior~~
5 ~~Alcohol RUD, any prohibited liquor establishment may continue in accordance with Planning Code~~
6 ~~Section through 186.2, subject to the following provisions:~~

7 ~~(A) A prohibited liquor establishment lawfully existing and selling alcoholic~~
8 ~~beverages as licensed by the State of California prior to the effective date of this legislation, or~~
9 ~~subsequent legislation prohibiting that type of liquor establishment, so long as otherwise lawful may~~
10 ~~continue to operate only under the following conditions, as provided by California Business and~~
11 ~~Professions Code Section 23790:~~

12 ~~(i) Except as provided in Subsection (B) below, the premises shall retain~~
13 ~~the same type of retail liquor license within a license classification; and~~

14 ~~(ii) Except as provided in Subsection (B) below, the liquor establishment~~
15 ~~shall be operated continuously, without substantial changes in mode or character of operation.~~

16 ~~(B) A break in continuous service shall not be interpreted to include the~~
17 ~~following, provided that, except as indicated below, the location of the establishment does not change,~~
18 ~~the square footage used for the sale of alcoholic beverages does not increase, and the type of ABC~~
19 ~~License does not change:~~

20 ~~(i) a change in ownership of a prohibited liquor establishment or an~~
21 ~~owner to owner transfer of an ABC License;~~

22 ~~(ii) a temporary closure for restoration or repair of an existing prohibited~~
23 ~~liquor establishment on the same lot after total or partial destruction or damage due to fire, riot,~~
24 ~~insurrection, toxic accident, or act of God;~~

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

in Sec. 716.1)
Outer Clement Street Neighborhood Commercial District (Defined in Sec. 717.1)
Upper Fillmore Street Neighborhood Commercial District (Defined in Sec. 718.1)
Haight Street Neighborhood Commercial District (Defined in Sec. 719.1)
Inner Sunset Neighborhood Commercial District (Defined in Sec. 730.1)
Upper Market Street Neighborhood Commercial District (Defined in Sec. 721.1)
North Beach Neighborhood Commercial District (Defined in Sec. 722.1)
Pacific Avenue Neighborhood Commercial District (Defined in Sec. 732.1)
Polk Street Neighborhood Commercial District (Defined in Sec. 723.1)
Sacramento Street Neighborhood Commercial District (Defined in Sec. 724.1)
Union Street Neighborhood Commercial District (Defined in Sec. 725.1)

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

24th Street-Noe Valley Neighborhood Commercial District (Defined in Sec. 728.1)
West Portal Avenue Neighborhood Commercial District (Defined in Sec. 729.1)
Noriega Street Neighborhood Commercial District (Defined in Sec. 739.1)
Irving Street Neighborhood Commercial District (Defined in Sec. 740.1)
Taraval Street Neighborhood Commercial District (Defined in Sec. 741.1)
Judah Street Neighborhood Commercial District (Defined in Sec. 742.1)
Regional Commercial District (Defined in Sec. 744)
<i>Excelsior Outer Mission Neighborhood Commercial District (Defined in Sec. 745.1)</i>

Neighborhood Commercial Restricted Use Districts and Subdistricts (Defined in Sec. 781)
Taraval Street Restaurant Subdistrict (Defined in Sec. 781.1)
Geary Boulevard Formula Retail Pet Supply Store and Formula

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

Retail Eating and Drinking Subdistrict (Defined in Sec. 781.4)
Mission Street Formula Retail Restaurant Subdistrict (Defined in Sec. 781.5)
North Beach Financial Service, Limited Financial Service, and Business or Professional Service Subdistrict (Defined in Sec. 781.6)
Chestnut Street Financial Subdistrict (Defined in Sec. 781.7)
Mission Alcoholic Beverage Special Use District (Defined in Sec. 781.8)
Haight Street Alcohol Special Use District (Defined in Sec. 781.9)
17th and Rhode Island Street Grocery Store Special Use District (Defined in Sec. 781.10)
Third Street Alcohol Restricted Use District (Defined in Sec. 782)
Divisadero Street Alcohol Restricted Use District (Defined in Sec. 783)
Lower Haight Street Alcohol Restricted Use District (Defined in Sec. 784)
Excelsior Alcohol Restricted Use District (Defined in Sec. 785)
Lower Haight Street Tobacco Paraphernalia Restricted Use District (Defined in Sec. 786)
Fringe Financial Service Restricted Use District (Defined in Sec.

1 249.35)

2
3 * * * *

4
5 In addition to the classes of use districts in the above table, the following terms shall apply:

6 "R District" shall mean any RH-1(D), RH-1, RH-1(S), RH-2, RH-3, RM-1, ~~RM-2~~ ~~RM-1~~,
7 RM-3, RM-4, RTO, RTO-M, RC-1, RC-2, RC-3, or RC-4 District;

8 "M District" shall mean any M-1 or M-2 District;

9 "PDR District" shall mean any PDR-1-B, PDR-1-D, PDR-1-G or PDR-2 District;

10 "RH District" shall mean any RH-1(D), RH-1, RH-1(S), RH-2, or RH-3 District;

11 "RM District" shall mean any RM-1, RM-2, RM-3, or RM-4 District;

12 "RTO District" shall mean any RTO or RTO-M District;

13 "C-3 District" shall mean any C-3-O, C-3-R, C-3-G, or C-3-S District. For the purposes
14 of Section 128 and Article 11 of this Code, the term "C-3 District" shall also include the South
15 of Market Extended Preservation District designated on Section Map SU03 of the Zoning
16 Map;

17 "NCT District" shall mean any district listed in Section 702.1(b), including any NCT-1,
18 NCT-2, NCT-3, and any Neighborhood Commercial Transit District identified by street or area
19 name; and

20 "Mixed Use District" shall mean all Chinatown Mixed use, South of Market Mixed Use,
21 Eastern Neighborhood Mixed use, and Downtown Residential Districts.

22 **SEC. 207.4. DENSITY OF DWELLING UNITS IN NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL**
23 **DISTRICTS.**

24 The density of dwelling units in Neighborhood Commercial Districts shall be as stated
25 in the following subsections:

(a) The rules for calculation of dwelling unit densities set forth in Section 207.1 of this Code shall apply in Neighborhood Commercial Districts, except that any remaining fraction of 1/2 or more of the minimum amount of lot area per dwelling unit shall be adjusted upward to the next higher whole number of dwelling units.

The dwelling unit density in Neighborhood Commercial Districts shall be at a density ratio not exceeding the number of dwelling units permitted in the nearest Residential District, provided that the maximum density ratio shall in no case be less than the amount set forth in the zoning control following table for the district. The distance to each Residential District shall be measured from the midpoint of the front lot line or from a point directly across the street therefrom, whichever permits the greater density.

<i>NC District</i>	<i>Residential Density Limits</i>
<i>NC-1</i>	<i>One dwelling unit for each 800 sq. ft. of lot area.</i>
<i>NC-2</i>	
<i>NC-S</i>	
<i>Inner Sunset</i>	
<i>Sacramento Street</i>	
<i>West Portal Avenue</i>	
<i>NC-3</i>	<i>One dwelling unit for each 600 sq. ft. of lot area.</i>
<i>Castro Street</i>	
<i>Inner Clement Street</i>	
<i>Outer Clement Street</i>	
<i>Upper Fillmore Street</i>	
<i>Haight Street</i>	
<i>Union Street</i>	

1	<i>24th Street Mission</i>	<i>One dwelling unit for each 400 sq. ft. of lot area.</i>
2	<i>24th Street Noe Valley</i>	
3	<i>Broadway</i>	
4	<i>Upper Market Street</i>	
5	<i>North Beach</i>	
6	<i>Polk Street</i>	

8 (b) The dwelling unit density for dwellings specifically designed for and occupied by
9 senior citizens or *physically handicapped* persons *with physical disabilities* shall be at a density
10 ratio not exceeding twice the number of dwelling units permitted by the limits set forth in
11 Subsection (a).

12 (c) The dwelling unit density in the RCD District and NCT Districts, as listed in Section
13 702.1(b), shall not be limited by lot area, but by the applicable requirements and limitations
14 elsewhere in this Code, including but not limited to height, bulk, setbacks, open space,
15 exposure, and unit mix, as well as by applicable design guidelines, applicable elements and
16 area plans of the General Plan, and design review by the Planning Department.

17 **SEC. 249.35. FRINGE FINANCIAL SERVICE RESTRICTED USE DISTRICT.**

18 (a) **Findings.** There are an unusually large number of establishments providing fringe
19 financial services, including check cashing and payday lending, in the neighborhoods included
20 in the Mission Alcoholic Beverage Special Use District, the North of Market Residential
21 Special Use District, the Divisadero Street Alcohol Restricted Use District, the Third Street
22 Alcohol Restricted Use District, *and* the Haight Street Alcohol Restricted Use Subdistrict *and*
23 *the proposed Excelsior Alcohol Restricted Use District*. The unchecked proliferation of these
24 businesses has the potential to displace other financial service providers, including charter
25 banks, which offer a much broader range of financial services, as well as other desired

1 commercial development in the City, which provides a broad range of neighborhood
2 commercial goods and services.

3 (b) **Establishment of the Fringe Financial Service Restricted Use District.** In order
4 to preserve the residential character and the neighborhood-serving commercial uses of the
5 following defined areas, a noncontiguous Fringe Financial Service Restricted Use District
6 (Fringe Financial Service RUD) is hereby established for the following properties:

7 (1) Properties in the Mission Alcoholic Beverage Special Use District, as
8 described in Section 781.8 of this Code and as designated on Zoning Maps Numbers SU07
9 and SU08 of the Zoning Map of the City and County of San Francisco;

10 (2) Properties in the North of Market Residential Special Use District, as
11 described in Section 249.5 of this Code and as designated on Zoning Maps Numbers SU01
12 and SU02;

13 (3) Properties in the Divisadero Street Alcohol Restricted Use District, as
14 described in Section 783 of this Code and as designated on Zoning Maps Numbers SU02 and
15 SU07 of the Zoning Map of the City and County of San Francisco and the Excelsior Outer
16 Mission Street Neighborhood Commercial District, as described in Section 745 of this Code and as
17 designated on Zoning Map ZN08 of the Zoning Map of the City and County of San Francisco;

18 (4) Properties in the Third Street Alcohol Restricted Use District, as described in
19 Section 782 of this Code and as designated on Zoning Map Number SU10 of the Zoning Map
20 of the City and County of San Francisco; and

21 (5) Properties in the Haight Street Alcohol Restricted Use Subdistrict, as
22 described in Section 781.9 of this Code and as designated on Zoning Maps Numbers SU06
23 and SU07 of the Zoning Map of the City and County of San Francisco; ~~and~~

24 ~~(6) Properties in the proposed Excelsior Alcohol Restricted Use District, which included~~
25 ~~Assessor's Blocks and Lots fronting on both sides of Mission Street from Silver Avenue to the Daly City~~

1 ~~San Francisco border as set forth in Special Use District Maps SU11 and SU12 of the Zoning Map of~~
2 ~~the City and County of San Francisco. Inclusion of these properties in the Fringe Financial Service~~
3 ~~RUD shall survive any sunset provisions of the proposed Excelsior Alcohol Restricted Use District.~~

4 * * * *

5 **SEC. 263.20. SPECIAL HEIGHT EXCEPTION: ADDITIONAL FIVE FEET HEIGHT FOR**
6 **ACTIVE GROUND FLOOR USES IN CERTAIN DISTRICTS.**

7 (a) **Intent.** In order to encourage generous ground floor ceiling heights for commercial
8 and other active uses, encourage additional light and air into ground floor spaces, allow for
9 walk-up ground floor residential uses to be raised slightly from sidewalk level for privacy and
10 usability of front stoops, and create better building frontage on the public street, up to an
11 additional 5' of height is allowed along major streets in NCT districts, or in specific districts
12 listed below, for buildings that feature either higher ground floor ceilings for non-residential
13 uses or ground floor residential units (that have direct walk-up access from the sidewalk)
14 raised up from sidewalk level.

15 (b) **Applicability.** The special height exception described in this section shall only
16 apply to projects that meet all of the following criteria:

17 (1) project is located in a 30-X, 40-X or 50-X Height and Bulk District as
18 designated on the Zoning Map;

19 (2) project is located in one of the following districts:

20 (A) in an NCT district as designated on the Zoning Map;

21 (B) in the 24th Street – Noe Valley, Castro Street, Upper Market Street,
22 Inner Clement Street and Outer Clement Street NCDs; Excelsior Outer Mission Street, Irving
23 Street, Judah Street, Noriega Street, Taraval Street NCDs;

24 ~~(C) on a NC 2 or NC 3 designated parcel fronting Mission Street, from Silver~~
25 ~~Avenue to the Daly City border;~~

1 ~~(C) (D)~~ on a NC-2 designated parcel on Balboa Street between 2nd
2 Avenue and 8th Avenue, and between 32nd Avenue and 39th Avenue;

3 ~~(D) (E)~~ on a NC-1 designated parcel within the boundaries of Sargent
4 Street to Orizaba Avenue to Lobos Street to Plymouth Avenue to Farallones Street to San
5 Jose Avenue to Alemany Boulevard to 19th Avenue to Randolph Street to Monticello Street
6 and back to Sargent Street; ~~or~~

7 ~~(E) (F)~~ on a NC-3 designated parcel fronting on Geary Boulevard from
8 Masonic Avenue to 28th Avenue, except for parcels on the north side of Geary Boulevard
9 between Palm Avenue and Parker Avenue; or

10 ~~(F) (G)~~ on a parcel zoned NC-1 ~~or NC 2 with a commercial use on the ground~~
11 ~~floor~~ on Noriega, Irving, Taraval, or Judah Streets west of 19th Avenue; ~~;~~

12 ~~(H) on a parcel zoned NC 1 or NC 2 with a commercial use on the ground floor~~
13 ~~on Irving Street west of 19th Avenue;~~

14 ~~(I) on a parcel zoned NC 1 or NC 2 with a commercial use on the ground floor~~
15 ~~on Taraval Street west of 19th Avenue;~~

16 ~~(J) on a parcel zoned NC 1 or NC 2 with a commercial use on the ground floor~~
17 ~~on Judah Street west of 19th Avenue;~~

18 (3) project features ground floor commercial space or other active use as
19 defined by Section 145.1(b)(2) with clear ceiling heights in excess of ten feet from sidewalk
20 grade, or in the case of residential uses, such walk-up residential units are raised up from
21 sidewalk level;

22 (4) said ground floor commercial space, active use, or walk-up residential use is
23 primarily oriented along a right-of-way wider than 40 feet;

24 (5) said ground floor commercial space or active use occupies at least 50% of
25 the project's ground floor area; and

1 (6) except for projects located in NCT districts, the project sponsor has
2 conclusively demonstrated that the additional 5' increment allowed through Section 263.20
3 would not add new shadow to any public open spaces.

4 (c) One additional foot of height, up to a total of five feet, shall be permitted above the
5 designated height limit for each additional foot of ground floor clear ceiling height in excess of
6 10 feet from sidewalk grade, or in the case of residential units, for each foot the unit is raised
7 above sidewalk grade.

8 (Diagram not shown but not to be deleted.)

9 **SEC. 607.1. NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL AND RESIDENTIAL-COMMERCIAL**
10 **DISTRICTS.**

11 * * * *

12 (f) **Business Signs.** Business signs, as defined in Section 602.3 shall be permitted in
13 all Neighborhood Commercial and Residential-Commercial Districts subject to the limits set forth
14 below.

15 (1) **NC-1 and NCT-1 Districts.**

16 (A) **Window Signs.** The total area of all window signs, as defined in
17 Section 602.1(b), shall not exceed 1/3 the area of the window on or in which the signs are
18 located. Such signs may be nonilluminated, indirectly illuminated, or directly illuminated.

19 (B) **Wall Signs.** The area of all wall signs shall not exceed one square
20 foot per square foot of street frontage occupied by the business measured along the wall to
21 which the signs are attached, or 50 square feet for each street frontage, whichever is less.
22 The height of any wall sign shall not exceed 15 feet or the height of the wall to which it is
23 attached. Such signs may be nonilluminated or indirectly illuminated; or during business
24 hours, may be directly illuminated.

1 (C) **Projecting Signs.** The number of projecting signs shall not exceed
2 one per business. The area of such sign, as defined in Section 602.1(a), shall not exceed 24
3 square feet. The height of such sign shall not exceed 15 feet or the height of the wall to which
4 it is attached. No part of the sign shall project more than 75 percent of the horizontal distance
5 from the street property line to the curblin, or six feet six inches, whichever is less. The sign
6 may be nonilluminated or indirectly illuminated, or during business hours, may be directly
7 illuminated.

8 (D) **Signs on Awnings.** Sign copy may be located on permitted awnings
9 in lieu of wall signs and projecting signs. The area of such sign copy as defined in Section
10 602.1(c) shall not exceed 20 square feet. Such sign copy may be nonilluminated or indirectly
11 illuminated.

12 (2) **RC, NC-2, NCT-2, NC-S, Broadway, Castro Street, Inner Clement Street,**
13 **Outer Clement Street, Upper Fillmore Street, Inner Sunset, Irving Street, Haight Street,**
14 **Hayes-Gough, Judah Street, Upper Market Street, Excelsior Outer Mission Street, Noriega**
15 **Street, North Beach, Ocean Avenue, Pacific Avenue, Polk Street, Sacramento Street,**
16 **SoMa, Taraval Street, Union Street, Valencia Street, 24th Street - Mission, 24th Street -**
17 **Noe Valley, West Portal Avenue, Glen Park, RCD, and Folsom Street Neighborhood**
18 **Commercial Districts.**

19 (A) **Window Signs.** The total area of all window signs, as defined in
20 Section 602.1(b), shall not exceed 1/3 the area of the window on or in which the signs are
21 located. Such signs may be nonilluminated, indirectly illuminated, or directly illuminated.

22 (B) **Wall Signs.** The area of all wall signs shall not exceed two square
23 feet per foot of street frontage occupied by the use measured along the wall to which the
24 signs are attached, or 100 square feet for each street frontage, whichever is less. The height
25 of any wall sign shall not exceed 24 feet, or the height of the wall to which it is attached, or the

1 height of the lowest of any residential windowsill on the wall to which the sign is attached,
2 whichever is lower. Such signs may be nonilluminated, indirectly, or directly illuminated.

3 (C) **Projecting Signs.** The number of projecting signs shall not exceed
4 one per business. The area of such sign, as defined in Section 602.1(a), shall not exceed 24
5 square feet. The height of such sign shall not exceed 24 feet, or the height of the wall to which
6 it is attached, or the height of the lowest of any residential windowsill on the wall to which the
7 sign is attached, whichever is lower. No part of the sign shall project more than 75 percent of
8 the horizontal distance from the street property line to the curblin, or six feet six inches,
9 whichever is less. Such signs may be nonilluminated or indirectly illuminated; or during
10 business hours, may be directly illuminated.

11 (D) **Signs on Awnings and Marquees.** Sign copy may be located on
12 permitted awnings or marquees in lieu of projecting signs. The area of such sign copy as
13 defined in Section 602.1(c) shall not exceed 30 square feet. Such sign copy may be
14 nonilluminated or indirectly illuminated; except that sign copy on marquees for movie theaters
15 or places of entertainment may be directly illuminated during business hours.

16 (E) **Freestanding Signs and Sign Towers.** With the exception of
17 automotive gas and service stations, which are regulated under Paragraph 607.1(f)(4), one
18 freestanding sign or sign tower per lot shall be permitted in lieu of a projecting sign, if the
19 building or buildings are recessed from the street property line. The existence of a
20 freestanding business sign shall preclude the erection of a freestanding identifying sign on the
21 same lot. The area of such freestanding sign or sign tower, as defined in Section 602.1(a),
22 shall not exceed 20 square feet nor shall the height of the sign exceed 24 feet. No part of the
23 sign shall project more than 75 percent of the horizontal distance from the street property line
24 to the curblin, or six feet, whichever is less. Such signs may be nonilluminated or indirectly
25 illuminated; or during business hours, may be directly illuminated.

1 (3) **Mission Street NCT, NC-3, and NCT-3 Neighborhood Commercial**
2 **Districts.**

3 (A) **Window Signs.** The total area of all window signs, as defined in
4 Section 602.1(b), shall not exceed 1/3 the area of the window on or in which the signs are
5 located. Such signs may be nonilluminated, indirectly illuminated, or directly illuminated.

6 (B) **Wall Signs.** The area of all wall signs shall not exceed three square
7 feet per foot of street frontage occupied by the use measured along the wall to which the
8 signs are attached, or 150 square feet for each street frontage, whichever is less. The height
9 of any wall sign shall not exceed 24 feet, or the height of the wall to which it is attached, or the
10 height of the lowest of any residential windowsill on the wall to which the sign is attached,
11 whichever is lower. Such signs may be nonilluminated, indirectly, or directly illuminated.

12 (C) **Projecting Signs.** The number of projecting signs shall not exceed
13 one per business. The area of such sign, as defined in Section 602.1(a), shall not exceed 32
14 square feet. The height of the sign shall not exceed 24 feet, or the height of the wall to which it
15 is attached, or the height of the lowest of any residential windowsill on the wall to which the
16 sign is attached, whichever is lower. No part of the sign shall project more than 75 percent of
17 the horizontal distance from the street property line to the curblineline, or six feet six inches,
18 whichever is less. Such signs may be nonilluminated, indirectly, or directly illuminated.

19 (D) **Sign Copy on Awnings and Marquees.** Sign copy may be located
20 on permitted awnings or marquees in lieu of projecting signs. The area of such sign copy, as
21 defined in Section 602.1(c), shall not exceed 40 square feet. Such sign copy may be
22 nonilluminated or indirectly illuminated; except that sign copy on marquees for movie theaters
23 or places of entertainment may be directly illuminated during business hours.

24 (E) **Freestanding Signs and Sign Towers.** With the exception of
25 automotive gas and service stations, which are regulated under Paragraph 607.1(f)(4) of this

1 Code, one freestanding sign or sign tower per lot shall be permitted in lieu of a projecting sign
2 if the building or buildings are recessed from the street property line. The existence of a
3 freestanding business sign shall preclude the erection of a freestanding identifying sign on the
4 same lot. The area of such freestanding sign or sign tower, as defined in Section 602.1(a),
5 shall not exceed 30 square feet nor shall the height of the sign exceed 24 feet. No part of the
6 sign shall project more than 75 percent of the horizontal distance from the street property line
7 to the curbline, or six feet, whichever is less. Such signs may be nonilluminated or indirectly
8 illuminated, or during business hours, may be directly illuminated.

9 (4) **Special Standards for Automotive Gas and Service Stations.** For
10 automotive gas and service stations in Neighborhood Commercial Districts, only the following
11 signs are permitted, subject to the standards in this Paragraph (f)(4) and to all other standards
12 in this Section 607.1.

13 (A) A maximum of two oil company signs, which shall not extend ~~more~~
14 ~~than 10 feet~~ above the roofline if attached to a building, or exceed the maximum height
15 permitted for freestanding signs in the same district if freestanding. The area of any such sign
16 shall not exceed 180 square feet, and along each street frontage, all parts of such a sign or
17 signs that are within 10 feet of the street property line shall not exceed 80 square feet in area.
18 No such sign shall project more than five feet beyond any street property line. The areas of
19 other permanent and temporary signs as covered in Subparagraph (B) below shall not be
20 included in the calculation of the areas specified in this Subparagraph.

21 (B) Other permanent and temporary business signs, not to exceed 30
22 square feet in area for each such sign or a total of 180 square feet for all such signs on the
23 premises. No such sign shall extend above the roofline if attached to a building, or in any case
24 project beyond any street property line or building setback line.

25 * * * *

1 **SEC. 702.1. NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL USE DISTRICTS.**

2 (a) The following districts are established for the purpose of implementing the
3 Commerce and Industry element and other elements of the General Plan, according to the
4 objective and policies stated therein. Description and Purpose Statements outline the main
5 functions of each Neighborhood Commercial (NC) District in the Zoning Plan for San
6 Francisco, supplementing the statements of purpose contained in Section 101 of this Code.

7 The description and purpose statements and land use controls applicable to each of
8 the general and individual area districts are set forth in this Code for each district class. The
9 boundaries of the various Neighborhood Commercial Districts are shown on the Zoning Map
10 referred to in Sections 105 and 106 of this Code, subject to the provisions of that Section.

11

12 * * * *

13 Named Neighborhood Commercial Districts	Section Number
14 Broadway Neighborhood Commercial District	§ 714
15 Castro Street Neighborhood Commercial District	§ 715
16 Inner Clement Street Neighborhood Commercial District	§ 716
17 Outer Clement Street Neighborhood Commercial District	§ 717
18 Upper Fillmore Street Neighborhood Commercial District	§ 718
19 Haight Street Neighborhood Commercial District	§ 719
20 Upper Market Street Neighborhood Commercial District	§ 721
21 North Beach Neighborhood Commercial District	§ 722
22 Polk Street Neighborhood Commercial District	§ 723
23 Sacramento Street Neighborhood Commercial District	§ 724
24 Union Street Neighborhood Commercial District	§ 725
24 24th Street-Noe Valley Neighborhood Commercial District	§ 728
25 West Portal Avenue Neighborhood Commercial District	§ 729

1	Inner Sunset Neighborhood Commercial District	§ 730
2	Glen Park Neighborhood Commercial Transit District	§ 738.1
3	Noriega Street Neighborhood Commercial District	§739.1
4	Irving Street Neighborhood Commercial District	§740.1
5	Taraval Street Neighborhood Commercial District	§741.1
6	Judah Street Neighborhood Commercial District	§742.1
7	Folsom Street Neighborhood Commercial Transit District	§ 743.1
8	Regional Commercial District	§ 744.1
9	<i>Excelsior Outer Mission Street Neighborhood Commercial District</i>	<i>§ 745.1</i>

10 * * * *

11
12 **SEC. 702.3. NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL RESTRICTED USE SUBDISTRICTS.**

13 In addition to the Neighborhood Commercial Use Districts established by Section 702.1
14 of this Code, certain Neighborhood Commercial Special Use Districts are established for the
15 purpose of controlling the expansion of certain kinds of uses which if uncontrolled may
16 adversely affect the character of certain Neighborhood Commercial Districts.

17 The purposes and provisions set forth in Sections 781.1 through 781.6, Sections 783 –
18 786, and Sections 249.35 – 249.99 of this Code shall apply respectively within these districts.
19 The boundaries of the districts are as shown on the Zoning Map as referred to in Section 105
20 of this Code, subject to the provisions of that Section.

Neighborhood Commercial Restricted Use Subdistricts	Section Number
Taraval Street Restaurant Subdistrict	§ 781.1
Geary Boulevard Formula Retail Pet Supply Store and Formula	§ 781.4

Retail Eating and Drinking Subdistrict	
Mission Street Formula Retail Restaurant Subdistrict	§ 781.5
North Beach Financial Service, Limited Financial Service, and Business or Professional Service Subdistrict	§ 781.6
Chestnut Street Financial	§ 781.7
Haight Street Alcohol Restricted Use District	§ 781.9
Divisadero Street Alcohol Restricted Use District	§ 783
Lower Haight Street Alcohol Restricted Use District	§ 784
<i>Excelsior Alcohol Special Use District</i>	§ 785
Fringe Financial Service Restricted Use District	§ 249.35
Mission Alcohol Restricted Use District	§ 249.60 (formerly 781.8)
Third Street Alcohol Restricted Use District	§ 249.62 (formerly 782)

Section 5. Sheets ZN08 of the Zoning Map of the City and County of San Francisco is hereby amended, as follows:


	<u>Description of Property</u>	<u>Use District to be Superseded</u>	<u>Use District Hereby Approved</u>
1			
2			
3	All parcels zoned NC-3	NC-3	Excelsior Outer Mission Street
4	on Blocks 3147, 3148, 3206,		Neighborhood Commercial
5	3207, 3208A, 5893, 6013,		District
6	6014, 6083, 6084, 6272,		
7	6346, 6347, 6408, 6409,		
8	6410, 6411, 6412, 6463,		
9	6796, 6797, 6798, 6799, 6800,		
10	6954, 6955, 6956, 6957, 6959,		
11	6968, 6969, 7029A, 7030,		
12	All parcels zoned NC-2 on	NC-2	Excelsior Outer Mission Street
13	Blocks 5868, 5869, 5892,		Neighborhood Commercial
14	5893, 6462, 6461, 6468, 6468A,		District
15	6469, 6470, 6471, 6472, 6473,		
16	6474, 6802, 6803, 6804, 7031,		
17	7043, 7044A, 7066, 7098, 7099,		
18	7109, 7109A, 7142, 7143, 7144,		
19	7145, and 7160		
20	All parcels zoned NC-1 on	NC-1	Excelsior Outer Mission Street
21	Blocks 6404, 6405, 6413,		Neighborhood Commercial
22	6414, 6446, and 6482		District
23	Block 6413, Lot 002; Block	RH-1	Excelsior Outer Mission Street
24	7030, Lots 022A, 035, and 036;		Neighborhood Commercial
25	Block 6969, Lot 005G		District

1 Section 6. Effective Date. This ordinance shall become effective 30 days after
2 enactment. Enactment occurs when the Mayor signs the ordinance, the Mayor returns the
3 ordinance unsigned or does not sign the ordinance within ten days of receiving it, or the Board
4 of Supervisors overrides the Mayor's veto of the ordinance.

5
6 Section 7. Scope of Ordinance. In enacting this ordinance, the Board of Supervisors
7 intends to amend only those words, phrases, paragraphs, subsections, sections, articles,
8 numbers, punctuation marks, charts, diagrams, or any other constituent parts of the Municipal
9 Code that are explicitly shown in this ordinance as additions, deletions, Board amendment
10 additions, and Board amendment deletions in accordance with the "Note" that appears under
11 the official title of the ordinance

12
13 APPROVED AS TO FORM:
14 DENNIS J. HERRERA, City Attorney

15 By:


16 JUDITH A. BOYAJIAN
Deputy City Attorney

17
18 n:\legana\as2013\1300263\00842672.doc

REVISED LEGISLATIVE DIGEST

(10/8/2013, Substituted)

[Planning Code, Zoning Map - Establishing the Excelsior Outer Mission Street Neighborhood Commercial District]

Ordinance amending the Planning Code to establish the Excelsior Outer Mission Street Neighborhood Commercial District (NCD) along Mission Street between Alemany Boulevard and the San Francisco-San Mateo County line; repealing the Excelsior Alcohol Restricted Use District and adding controls on liquor establishments to the new NCD; amending various sections to make conforming and other technical changes; amending the Zoning Map to rezone specified properties to the new NCD; and making environmental findings, and findings of consistency with the General Plan, and the eight priority policies of Planning Code, Section 101.1.

Existing Law

Article 7 of the Planning Code establishes a number of named districts in various San Francisco neighborhoods that have special controls. The Zoning Map maps these areas.

Amendments to Current Law

The Planning Code and Zoning Map are amended to add the new Excelsior Outer Mission Street Neighborhood Commercial District (NCD). The Excelsior Alcohol Restricted Use District is repealed and its controls on liquor establishments are included in the NCD. Conforming changes have been made to various other Code sections.

New Liquor Store uses with Type 20 or Type 21 ABC licenses are not permitted in the new NCD, however any use within the NCD with an existing Type 20 or Type 21 ABC license may obtain a new license, if required by the ABC, after it has been closed temporarily for repair, renovation, remodeling, or reconstruction. A Medical Cannabis Dispensary (MCD) seeking to relocate within 500 feet of another MCD may be allowed as a conditional use but any future amendments or regulations applicable to MCDs Citywide shall apply and will supersede the conditional use requirement. An MCD may be located above the ground floor only if it is accessible to persons with disabilities.

Background Information

The area included within the Excelsior Outer Mission Street NCD is mixed use, combining street-fronting retail businesses on the ground floor and housing on upper floors. The range of comparison goods and services offered is varied and often includes specialty retail stores, restaurants, and neighborhood-serving offices. The area is transit-oriented and the commercial uses serve residents of the area as well as residents and visitors from adjacent and other neighborhoods. The purpose of this legislation is to establish specific controls tailored to the needs of the area.

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: Ed Reiskin, Director, Municipal Transportation Agency
Greg Suhr, Chief, Police Department
John Rahaim, Director, Planning Department
Regina Dick-Endrizzi, Director, Small Business Commission
Kriztina Palone, Director, Neighborhood Services

FROM: Alisa Miller, Clerk, Land Use and Economic Development Committee
Board of Supervisors

DATE: February 5, 2013

SUBJECT: LEGISLATION INTRODUCED

The Board of Supervisors' Land Use and Economic Development Committee has received the following proposed legislation, introduced by Supervisor Avalos on January 29, 2013. This matter is being referred to your department for informational purposes.

File: 130084

Ordinance amending the Planning Code, by adding a new section, to establish the Outer Mission Street Neighborhood Commercial District along Mission Street between Alemany Boulevard and the San Francisco-San Mateo County line; repealing the Excelsior Alcohol Restricted Use District and adding controls on liquor establishments to the new Neighborhood Commercial District; amending various sections to make conforming and other technical changes; amending the Zoning Map to rezone specified properties to the new Neighborhood Commercial District; and making environmental findings, Planning Code, Section 302, findings, and findings of consistency with the General Plan and the Priority Policies of Planning Code, Section 101.1.

If you do wish to submit any additional reports or documentation to be included as part of the file, please send those to me at the Board of Supervisors, City Hall, Room 244, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, San Francisco, CA 94102.

c: Kate Breen, Municipal Transportation Agency
Janet Martinsen, Municipal Transportation Agency

*Non-physical exemption
CEQA Section 15060(c)(2)
J. Avalos 2/25/13*



SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Certificate of Determination EXCLUSION/EXEMPTION FROM ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

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

Reception:
415.558.6378

Fax:
415.558.6409

Planning
Information:
415.558.6377

Case No.: 2013.0281E
 Project Title: Board File No. 130084 (Establishing the Outer Mission Street Neighborhood Commercial District)
 Zoning: NC-1 (Neighborhood Commercial Cluster), NC-2 (Neighborhood Commercial, Small-Scale), NC-3 (Neighborhood Commercial, Moderate-Scale), and RH-1 (Residential, House Districts, One-Family)
 Height-Bulk: Various
 Block/Lot/ Lot Size: Various
 Project Sponsor: Supervisor Avalos, District 11, San Francisco Board of Supervisors
 Staff Contact: Joy Navarrete – (415) 575-9040
 Joy.Navarrete@sfgov.org

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

The proposed project is an ordinance that would amend San Francisco Planning Code by adding Section 745.1, establishing the Outer Mission Street Neighborhood Commercial District (Outer Mission Street NCD) on parcels along Mission Street between Alemany Boulevard and the San Francisco-San Mateo county line; repealing the Section 785, Excelsior Alcohol Restricted Use District and adding controls on liquor establishments to the new NCD. The ordinance would also amend Sections 249.35, 263.20, 607.1, and 702.1 to make conforming and other technical changes. Zoning Map Sheet ZN08 would be changed to reflect the rezoning of parcels to the Outer Mission Street NCD.

[Continued on following page.]

EXEMPT STATUS:

General Rule Exclusion (State CEQA Guidelines, Section 15061(b)(3))

REMARKS:

Please see next page.

DETERMINATION:

I do hereby certify that the above determination has been made pursuant to State and Local requirements.


 Sarah B. Jones
 Acting Environmental Review Officer

April 10, 2013

 Date

cc: Aaron Starr, San Francisco Planning Dept.
Supervisor Avalos

Virna Byrd, M.D.F

PROJECT DESCRIPTION (CONTINUED):

The proposed ordinance would replace general zoning districts with a named NCD (Outer Mission Street NCD). Named NCDs allow zoning controls to be tailored to the needs of a particular neighborhood without affecting zoning districts in other parts of the City.

Section 745.1, the Outer Mission Street NCD, would allow generally the same permitted uses and development standards as the NC-2 which is the current zoning designation for parcels within the proposed new special use district. The primary change would be to include the provision allowing an additional 5-foot height increase under certain circumstances as specified in Planning Code 263.20. Section 263.20 provides a 5-foot height exception for active ground floor uses in Neighborhood Commercial Transit (NCT) Districts, the Inner Clement, Outer Clement, Irving Street, Judah Street, Upper Market Street, Noriega Street, and Taraval Street NCDs, and certain NC-1, NC-2 and NC-3 parcels. In addition, the 5-foot height exception has been proposed for Divisadero, Glen Park and Fisherman's Wharf areas. The 5-foot special height exception is applicable to properties that contain ground-floor commercial, other active, or residential uses, where the ground-floor commercial space or active use occupies at least 50 percent of the project's ground floor area, and where the project sponsor has conclusively demonstrated that the additional 5-foot increment would not add new shadow to any public open space. Furthermore, Planning Code Section 263.20 specifies that 1 additional foot of height, up to a total of 5 feet, is permitted above the designated height limit for each additional foot of ground floor clear ceiling height in excess of 10 feet from sidewalk grade, or in the case of residential units, for each foot the unit is raised above sidewalk grade.

The 5-foot exception provided by Planning Code Section 263.20 is not sufficient to add another story but provides an incentive for developers to create lively ground-floor commercial spaces along NCD corridors. Older buildings along commercial streets in the 30-X, 40-X, and 50-X height districts are generally three or four stories with each story having a minimum of 12-foot clear ceiling heights, with spaces that are directly accessed from the street. The older residential buildings in these districts often have ground-floor units that are elevated several feet above the sidewalk level and include stoops to provide direct access to individual units. Newer buildings along commercial streets in the 30-X, 40-X and 50-X height districts, however, tend to have three, four or five 10-foot stories, and the residential buildings often contain a single ground-floor entrance lobby providing access to multiple dwelling units. These buildings generally lack visual interest and human scale and don't contribute to public life on the street. The intention of the 5-foot height exception is to encourage developers to incorporate the design elements of the older types of buildings into new commercial and residential development projects to offer more attractive uses that will better activate the public realm.

Figure 1 identifies the parcels proposed for the 5-foot height increase as part of the new Outer Mission Street NCD under proposed Board of Supervisors Ordinance No.130084.

REMARKS:

California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) State Guidelines Section 15061(b)(3) establishes the general rule that CEQA applies only to projects that have the potential to cause a significant effect on the

environment. Where it can be seen with certainty that there is no possibility that the activity in question may have a significant effect on the environment, the activity is not subject to CEQA.

Land Use. The proposed project would rezone parcels on Mission Street between Alemany Boulevard and the San Francisco-San Mateo County line currently zoned NC-3, and several zoned NC-1, RM-3, RM-4, and RH-3, to Outer Mission Street NCD. Parcels within the new NCD that are also in the 40-X and 50-X height and bulk district could be developed with projects up to 5 feet taller than other non-NCD properties in that height and bulk designation, as long as taller ground-floor retail space is included in the building design. All of the parcels are within the 40-X and 50-X height and bulk district.

The existing land use in the area covered by this legislation is generally ground-floor commercial uses with residential use on the upper floors, as well as multi-unit residential buildings. Most parcels are developed with a range of one- to eighteen-story buildings, though the majority of buildings are two- to four-stories in height. All parcels affected by this legislation that would be eligible for the additional 5-foot height are within an area where the existing buildings generally range from one- to four-story in height and with a commercial use on the ground floor with residential use on the upper floors.

Housing development is encouraged in new buildings above the ground floor in all NCDs. Future commercial growth is directed to the ground floor in order to promote more continuous and active retail frontage. The residential density would generally remain the same as the NC-3 district currently permits the same 1 unit per 600 square feet as the proposed Outer Mission Street NCD would. The residentially-zoned parcels would retain their current density in instances where it permits a higher density than 1 per 600 square feet. Therefore, there would not be any decrease in potential housing as a result of this rezoning.

A project could have a significant effect on land use if it would physically divide an established community; conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect; or have a substantial adverse impact on the existing character of the vicinity.

The proposed project would allow for slightly taller buildings to be constructed in the proposed Outer Mission Street NCD. However, this height would be consistent with other existing buildings in this area. The permitted land uses in this NCD would be similar to the existing NC-3 designation for the properties. Therefore, this rezoning would not be considered to cause a substantial adverse impact on the existing character of the NCD. Furthermore, the proposed project would not physically disrupt or divide an established community, or conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation that has been adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect. For these reasons, the proposed project would not result in a significant effect on land use.

Visual Quality and Urban Design. The proposed project would increase maximum permitted building heights along the Outer Mission Street NCD. These parcels are located on Mission Street between Alemany Boulevard and the San Francisco-San Mateo County line. The proposed height exception would be minor, up to 5 feet, and would occur within a highly developed urban environment. The 5-foot height exception is not so great as to allow another story to be added to an existing building. The parcels that are subject to the proposed height increase are mostly adjacent to residential districts, zoned RM-3 (Low-Density Mixed Residential) and RM-4 (Residential House, One-Family), and all which are designated 40-X and 50-X. The development of individual NCD parcels to a height 5 feet above existing

height allowances could be noticeable to immediate neighbors; however, in the dense urban character of development within and surrounding the NCDs, this minor increase in height would have correspondingly minor visual impacts.

In reviewing visual quality and urban design under CEQA generally, consideration of the existing context is required, and evaluation must be based on the impact on the existing environment. That some people may not find a given development project attractive does not mean that it creates a significant aesthetic environmental impact; projects must be judged in the context of the existing conditions. For the proposed height exception, the context is urban right-of-way that is already developed. Given the context and the minor allowable increase of up to 5 feet and the incremental nature of such development along an NCD, the proposed height exception would be consistent with the existing, developed environment, and its visual effects would not be unusual and would not create adverse aesthetic impacts on the environment. Furthermore, it would not be likely to result in a substantial, demonstrable negative aesthetic effect, or obstruct or degrade scenic views or vistas now observed from public areas. Thus, the proposed project would result in less-than-significant impacts on visual quality and urban design.

In addition, the increased height allowed by the proposed legislation would not directly or indirectly contribute to the generation of any obtrusive light or glare. For all the above reasons, proposed legislation would not result in a significant adverse effect on public views or aesthetics.

Historic Resources. The proposed special height exception could result in increased building heights within a potential historical district or affect known historical resources. The allowable increase in height, however, would be minor (up to 5 feet) and in and of itself would not result in a material impairment to a historic district or historic building. Projects taking advantage of the height exception could involve the reuse and remodeling of existing historical buildings, but such a minor height increase could be accomplished maintaining the general scale, design, and materials of the historical resources, thereby maintaining their historic context. Any development proposal taking advantage of the height exception would be subject to further review for a determination of whether the project would result in potential impacts to the environment, including historic resources. The proposed legislation therefore would not result in a significant effect on historical resources.

Noise and Air Quality. The proposed special height exception of up to 5 feet would potentially result in an incremental increase in construction activities or greater intensity of use at future development project sites, in that such development projects that would occur regardless of the proposed legislation could be up to 5 feet taller. Thus, the resulting increase in operational or construction noise would be minimal, and noise and air quality impacts would be less than significant.

Shadow. Planning Code Section 263.20(b)(6) specifies that the 5-foot special height exception is applicable to properties where the project sponsor has conclusively demonstrated that the additional 5-foot increment would not add new shadow to any public open space. For this reason, the proposed legislation would not result in a significant impact with regard to shadow.

Light and Air. The 5-foot special height exception could result in slightly taller development projects that could potentially change or reduce that amount of light and air available to adjacent buildings. Any such changes could be undesirable for those individuals affected. Given the minor increase in height that would be permitted, it is anticipated that any changes in light and air would also be minor and would not affect a substantial number of people. Thus, the potential impact of the proposed legislation on light and air would not be significant.

Wind. The proposed legislation would allow a minor 5-foot increase in height for future development projects. The parcels affected by this legislation which would be eligible for an additional five-foot height increase are within the 40-foot and 50-foot height district; thus, the maximum resulting building height would be 45 feet or 55 feet, respectively. In general, buildings up to 55 feet in height do not result in wind speeds that would exceed the hazard criterion of 26 miles per hour for a single hour of the year as established in the Planning Code Section 148. For this reason, the proposed legislation would not result in a significant impact with regard to wind.

Cumulative Impacts. The proposed 5-foot height exception could potentially result in a minimal increase in construction activities and greater intensity of use at individual future development project sites, in that such development projects that would occur regardless of the proposed legislation could be up to 5 feet taller. This increase in activities and intensity of use would not be considered significant. Thus, cumulative impacts would be less than significant.

Neighborhood Concerns. A "Notification of Project Receiving Environmental Review" was mailed on March 28, 2013, to potentially interested neighborhood groups. No comments were received.

Conclusion. CEQA Guidelines Section 15061(b)(3) provides an exemption from environmental review where it can be seen with certainty that the proposed project would not have a significant impact on the environment. As noted above, there are no unusual circumstances surrounding the current proposal that would suggest a reasonable possibility of a significant effect. Since the proposed project would have no significant environmental effects, it is appropriately exempt from environmental review under the General Rule Exclusion (CEQA Guidelines Section 15061(b)(3)).

Attachment: Figure 1 - Map showing Parcels within the proposed Outer Mission Street NCD

Outer Mission Street NCD: Proposed Zoning




Figure 1 Map showing the Proposed Outer Mission Street NCD



SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

April 19, 2013

Ms. Angela Calvillo, Clerk
Honorable Supervisor Avalos
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 2013.0281TZ:
Establish the Outer Mission NCD
Board File No. 130084
Planning Commission Recommendation: Approval with Modifications**

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisor Avalos,

On April 18, 2013, the Planning Commission conducted a duly noticed public hearing at regularly scheduled meetings to consider the proposed Ordinance that would establish the Outer Mission Street Neighborhood Commercial District introduced by Supervisor Scott Avalos. At the hearing, the Planning Commission recommended approval with modifications.

The proposed modifications include:


1. Under the list of NC-1 parcels included in the proposed NCD change 5405 to 6405.
2. Move Blocks 6802 and 6803 from the list of NC-3 parcels included in the proposed NCD to the list of NC-2 parcels included in the proposed NCD.
3. Add The Outer Mission Street NCD to the list of Zoning Districts in Section 201.
4. Modify Section 263.20 per the changes outlined in Exhibit F.
5. Remove the Excelsior Alcohol SUD from table 702.3
6. Require Conditional Use authorization for Medical Cannabis Dispensaries within 500' of an existing Medication Cannabis Dispensary instead of prohibiting them outright.

On April 10, 2013, The Department determined that the proposal ordinance would result in no physical impact on the environment. The Project was determined to be exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA") under the General Rule Exclusion (CEQA Guidelines Section 15061(b)(3)) as described in the determination contained in the Planning Department files for this Project.

Supervisor, please advise the City Attorney at your earliest convenience if you wish to incorporate the changes recommended by the Commissions.

Please find attached documents relating to the actions of both Commissions. If you have any questions or require further information please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'AnMarie Rodgers', with a long horizontal line extending to the right.

AnMarie Rodgers
Manager of Legislative Affairs

cc:

Judith A Boyajain, Deputy City Attorney
Jeremy Pollock, Aide to Supervisor Avalos
Alisa Miller, Office of the Clerk of the Board

Attachments

Planning Commission Resolution
Planning Department Executive Summary\
Exhibit F



SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Planning Commission Resolution No. 18846

HEARING DATE: APRIL 18, 2013

Project Name: Establish the Outer Mission Street NCD
Case Number: 2013.0281TZ [Board File No. 130084]
Initiated by: Supervisor Avalos/ Introduced January 29, 2013
Staff Contact: Aaron Starr, Legislative Affairs
aaron.starr@sfgov.org, 415-558-6362
Reviewed by: AnMarie Rodgers, Manager Legislative Affairs
anmarie.rodgers@sfgov.org, 415-558-6395

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 WITH MODIFICATIONS THAT WOULD AMEND THE SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING CODE BY ADDING A NEW SECTION TO ESTABLISH THE OUTER MISSION STREET NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL DISTRICT ALONG MISSION STREET BETWEEN ALEMANY BOULEVARD AND THE SAN FRANCISCO-SAN MATEO COUNTY LINE; REPEAL THE EXCELSIOR ALCOHOL RESTRICTED USE DISTRICT AND ADD CONTROLS ON LIQUOR ESTABLISHMENTS TO THE NEW NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL DISTRICT; AMEND VARIOUS SECTIONS TO MAKE CONFORMING AND OTHER TECHNICAL CHANGES; AMEND THE ZONING MAP TO REZONE SPECIFIED PROPERTIES TO THE NEW NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL DISTRICT; AND MAKE ENVIRONMENTAL FINDINGS, PLANNING CODE, SECTION 302, FINDINGS, AND FINDINGS OF CONSISTENCY WITH THE GENERAL PLAN AND THE PRIORITY POLICIES OF PLANNING CODE, SECTION 101.1.

PREAMBLE

Whereas, on January 29, 2013, Supervisor Avalos introduced a proposed Ordinance under Board of Supervisors (hereinafter "Board") File Number 13-0084 which would amend the San Francisco Planning Code by adding a new section to establish the Outer Mission Street Neighborhood Commercial District along Mission Street between Alemany Boulevard and the San Francisco-San Mateo County line; repeal the Excelsior Alcohol Restricted Use District and add controls on liquor establishments to the new Neighborhood Commercial District; amend various sections to make conforming and other technical changes; amend the Zoning Map to rezone specified properties to the new Neighborhood Commercial District; and make environmental findings, Planning Code, Section 302, findings, and findings of consistency with the General Plan and the Priority Policies of Planning Code, Section 101.1.

Whereas, on April 18, 2013, the San Francisco Planning Commission (hereinafter "Commission") conducted a duly noticed public hearing at a regularly scheduled meeting to consider the proposed Ordinance; and

Whereas, on April 10, 2013, the Project was determined to be exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA") under the General Rule Exclusion (CEQA Guidelines Section 15061(b)(3)) as described in the determination contained in the Planning Department files for this Project; and

Whereas, the 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 the applicant, 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 Commission has reviewed the proposed Ordinance; and

MOVED, that the Commission hereby recommends that the Board of Supervisors recommends *approval of the proposed Ordinance with modifications* and adopts the attached Draft Resolution to that effect.

The proposed modifications include:

1. Under the list of NC-1 parcels included in the proposed NCD change 5405 to 6405.
2. Move Blocks 6802 and 6803 from the list of NC-3 parcels included in the proposed NCD to the list of NC-2 parcels included in the proposed NCD.
3. Add The Outer Mission Street NCD to the list of Zoning Districts in Section 201
4. Modify Section 263.20 per the changes outlined in Exhibit F
5. Remove the Excelsior Alcohol SUD from table 702.3
6. Require Conditional Use Authorization for Medical Cannabis Dispensaries within 500' of an existing Medication Cannabis Dispensary instead of prohibiting them outright.

Pending ordinances which should be accommodated in this draft ordinance: This note is being provided as a courtesy to the City Attorney and the Clerk of the Board to help identify other Ordinances which may present conflicting amendments as the legislative process proceeds.

1. Sections 263.20 BF 120774 Permitting a Height Bonus in Castro Street and 24th Street NCDs
2. Sections 151.1, 702.1 BF Pending Western SoMa Plan
3. Sections 151.1, 263.20, 702.1, 702.3, 703.3 BF Pending Code Corrections Ordinance 2012
4. Sections 151.1, 263.20, 744.1, 607.1 BF 120796 Divisadero Street NCD

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:

- Individually named neighborhood commercial districts help to preserve and enhance the character of a neighborhood and a sense of identity.
 - Creating a new named NCD for this area will allow for the Alcohol and Fringe Financial Restricted Use Districts to be removed from the Planning Code, exchanging cumbersome overlays with more targeted controls.
 - Removing parking minimums and instituting parking maximums is consistent with the City's Transit First policy, the General Plan and will help increase the supply of housing in the City.
 - The modest increase in density will help add to the City's housing stock and encourage the creation of more affordable housing units.
 - Because of existing restrictions there are only so many areas of the City that allow Medical Cannabis Dispensaries (MCDs). Prohibiting new MCDs from being established within 500' of an existing MCD would further limit the number of available locations within the City. Further, the Commission does not want to set a precedent with this legislation that could be used in other Neighborhood Commercial Districts. Requiring Conditional Use authorization for MCDs that seek to locate within 500' of an existing MCD will help address the clustering issues for this neighborhood, while not further limiting available locations.
1. **General Plan Compliance.** The proposed Ordinance is consistent with the following Objectives and Policies of the General Plan:

I. COMMERCE & INDUSTRY ELEMENT

THE COMMERCE AND INDUSTRY ELEMENT OF THE GENERAL PLAN SETS FORTH OBJECTIVES AND POLICIES THAT ADDRESS THE BROAD RANGE OF ECONOMIC ACTIVITIES, FACILITIES, AND SUPPORT SYSTEMS THAT CONSTITUTE SAN FRANCISCO'S EMPLOYMENT AND SERVICE BASE.

OBJECTIVE 4

IMPROVE THE VIABILITY OF EXISTING INDUSTRY IN THE CITY AND THE ATTRACTIVENESS OF THE CITY AS A LOCATION FOR NEW INDUSTRY.

Policy 6.2

Promote economically vital neighborhood commercial districts which foster small business enterprises and entrepreneurship and which are responsive to economic and technological innovation in the marketplace and society.

The proposed legislation would create an individually named Neighborhood Commercial District on Mission Street, which would help to preserve and enhance the character of a neighborhood and create a sense of identity. The proposed changes will also allow this neighborhood to more easily respond to economic and technological innovation in the marketplace and society.

Policy 6.6

Adopt specific zoning districts, which conform to a generalized neighborhood commercial land use and density plan.

As amended, the proposed NCD conforms to the generalized neighborhood commercial land use and density plan published in the General Plan.

II. HOUSING ELEMENT

THE HOUSING ELEMENT IS INTENDED TO PROVIDE THE POLICY BACKGROUND FOR HOUSING PROGRAMS AND DECISIONS; AND TO PROVIDE BROAD DIRECTION TOWARDS MEETING THE CITY'S HOUSING GOALS. AS WITH OTHER ELEMENTS OF THE GENERAL PLAN, IT PROVIDES THE POLICY FRAMEWORK FOR FUTURE PLANNING DECISIONS, AND INDICATES THE NEXT STEPS THE CITY PLANS TO TAKE TO IMPLEMENT THE HOUSING ELEMENT'S OBJECTIVES AND POLICIES.

OBJECTIVE 1

IDENTIFY AND MAKE AVAILABLE FOR DEVELOPMENT ADEQUATE SITES TO MEET THE CITY'S HOUSING NEEDS, ESPECIALLY PERMANENTLY AFFORDABLE HOUSING.

Policy 1.10

Support new housing projects, especially affordable housing, where households can easily rely on public transportation, walking and bicycling for the majority of daily trips.

The proposed Ordinance will increase the development potential for lots currently zoned NC-1, NC-2 and RH-1; these lots are located along or adjacent to a major transit corridor, Mission Street. That coupled with their close proximity to a neighborhood commercial shopping district will allow future residents to easily rely on public transportation, walking and bicycling for the majority of daily trips.

OBJECTIVE 7

SECURE FUNDING AND RESOURCES FOR PERMANENTLY AFFORDABLE HOUSING, INCLUDING INNOVATIVE PROGRAMS THAT ARE NOT SOLELY RELIANT ON TRADITIONAL MECHANISMS OR CAPITAL.

Policy 7.5

Encourage the production of affordable housing through process and zoning accommodations, and prioritize affordable housing in the review and approval processes.

The proposed Ordinance will provide zoning accommodation by remove the minimum paring requirements for dwelling units, which encourages the production of affordable housing.

OBJECTIVE 11

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

Policy 11.3

Ensure growth is accommodated without substantially and adversely impacting existing residential neighborhood character.

The proposed Ordinance will allow for a moderate increase in dwelling unit density along a major transit corridor. This moderate increase will have a de minimis impact on surrounding residential district's neighborhood character.

OBJECTIVE 12

BALANCE HOUSING GROWTH WITH ADEQUATE INFRASTRUCTURE THAT SERVES THE CITY'S GROWING POPULATION.

Policy 12.1

Encourage new housing that relies on transit use and environmentally sustainable patterns of movement.

By removing minimum parking requirements and moderately increasing the allowable density on some parcels, the proposed Ordinance will encourage new housing along a major transit route; creating housing that relies on transit use and environmentally sustainable patterns of movement.

OBJECTIVE 13

PRIORITIZE SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT IN PLANNING FOR AND CONSTRUCTING NEW HOUSING.

Policy 13.1

Support "smart" regional growth that locates new housing close to jobs and transit.

Policy 13.3

Promote sustainable land use patterns that integrate housing with transportation in order to increase transit, pedestrian, and bicycle mode share.

The proposed Ordinance will increase the housing density along a major transit route and within a Neighborhood Commercial District bringing housing close to jobs in the commercial corridor and transit.

2. The proposed replacement project is consistent with the eight General Plan priority policies set forth in Section 101.1 in that:

- A) The existing neighborhood-serving retail uses will be preserved and enhanced and future opportunities for resident employment in and ownership of such businesses will be enhanced:

The proposed Ordinance does not propose significant changes to the controls in the subject Neighborhood Commercial Districts. However, creating named NCDs will allow the district to respond more easily to emerging issues that may impact opportunities for resident employment in and ownership of neighborhood-serving retail uses.

- B) The existing housing and neighborhood character will be conserved and protected in order to preserve the cultural and economic diversity of our neighborhoods:

The proposed legislation would create individually named Neighborhood Commercial Districts on Mission Street, which help to preserve and enhance the character of the neighborhood.

- C) The City's supply of affordable housing will be preserved and enhanced:

The proposed Ordinance will have no adverse effect on the City's supply of affordable housing. Removing the minimum parking controls will encourage more affordable housing in the proposed named NCD.

- D) The commuter traffic will not impede MUNI transit service or overburden our streets or neighborhood parking:

The proposed Ordinance will have no significant impact on commuter traffic impeding MUNI transit service or overburdening the streets or neighborhood parking.

- E) A diverse economic base will be maintained by protecting our industrial and service sectors from displacement due to commercial office development. And future opportunities for resident employment and ownership in these sectors will be enhanced:

The proposed Ordinance would not adversely affect the industrial or service sectors or future opportunities for resident employment or ownership in these sectors.

- F) The City will achieve the greatest possible preparedness to protect against injury and loss of life in an earthquake.

Preparedness against injury and loss of life in an earthquake is unaffected by the proposed Ordinance. Any new construction or alteration associated with a use would be executed in compliance with all applicable construction and safety measures.

- G) That landmark and historic buildings will be preserved:

Landmarks and historic buildings would be unaffected by the proposed Ordinance. Should a proposed use be located within a landmark or historic building, such site would be evaluated under

typical Planning Code provisions and comprehensive Planning Department policies.

- H) Parks and open space and their access to sunlight and vistas will be protected from development:

The City's parks and open space and their access to sunlight and vistas would be unaffected by the proposed Ordinance. It is not anticipated that permits would be such that sunlight access, to public or private property, would be adversely impacted.

I hereby certify that the Planning Commission ADOPTED the foregoing Resolution on April 18, 2013.

Jonas P Ionin
Acting Commission Secretary

AYES: Commissioners Borden, Fong, Hillis, Moore, and Wu

NAYS: Commissioner Antonini and Sugaya

ABSENT: none

ADOPTED: April 18, 2013



SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Executive Summary Zoning Map and Planning Code Text Change HEARING DATE: APRIL 18, 2013

Project Name: Establish the Outer Mission Street NCD
Case Number: 2013.0281TZ [Board File No. 130084]
Initiated by: Supervisor Avalos/ Introduced January 29, 2013
Staff Contact: Aaron Starr, Legislative Affairs
aaron.starr@sfgov.org, 415-558-6362
Reviewed by: AnMarie Rodgers, Manager Legislative Affairs
anmarie.rodgers@sfgov.org, 415-558-6395
Recommendation: **Recommend Approval with Modifications**

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

Reception:
415.558.6378

Fax:
415.558.6409

Planning
Information:
415.558.6377

PLANNING CODE AMENDMENT

The proposed Ordinance would amend the San Francisco Planning Code by adding a new section to establish the Outer Mission Street Neighborhood Commercial District along Mission Street between Alemany Boulevard and the San Francisco-San Mateo County line; repeal the Excelsior Alcohol Restricted Use District and add controls on liquor establishments to the new Neighborhood Commercial District; amend various sections to make conforming and other technical changes; amend the Zoning Map to rezone specified properties to the new Neighborhood Commercial District; and make environmental findings, Planning Code, Section 302, findings, and findings of consistency with the General Plan and the Priority Policies of Planning Code, Section 101.1.

The Way It Is Now:

- Properties along Mission Street between Alemany Boulevard and the San Francisco-San Mateo County line are zoned *Neighborhood Commercial, Small-Scale (NC-2)* and *Neighborhood Commercial, Moderate Scale (NC-3)*. Properties around the intersection of Geneva Avenue and Naples Street are zoned *Neighborhood Commercial, Cluster (NC-1)*. Properties between Alemany Boulevard and Mission Street on Geneva Avenue and the property at the corner of Rolph and Naples are zoned RH-1. (See Exhibit C for a map of existing zoning.)
- The Excelsior Alcohol Restricted Use District (RUD) includes properties that front on Mission Street from Silver Avenue to the San Francisco-San Mateo County line. The RUD prohibits new liquor establishments selling alcoholic beverages for off-site consumption.
- RH-1, NC-1, NC-2 and NC-3 Districts have minimum parking requirements that are outlined in Planning Code Section 151.
- There are no special restrictions on Medical Cannabis Dispensaries (MCDs) in this area of the City.
- The Alcohol RUD is within the Fringe Financial Services RUD, which prohibits Fringe Financial Services (aka check cashing or pay day loan businesses) within ¼ of a mile of the district.

- The Planning Code currently permits a five foot height bonus for properties zoned 40-X and 50-X in the NC-3 District along Mission Street from Silver Avenue to the SF-SM County boarder.

The Way It Would Be:

The proposed legislation would:

- Create a new named Neighborhood Commercial District along Mission Street between Alemany Boulevard and the San Francisco-San Mateo County line with size and use controls similar to NC-3 controls. The proposed district would also include properties zoned NC-3 on Ocean Avenue between Alemany Blvd. and Mission St., and on Geneva between Mission and Alemany Blvd. Properties currently zoned NC-1 at the intersection of Geneva Avenue and Naples Street, four properties zoned RH-1 on Geneva between Mission and Alemany and one property zoned RH-1 on the corner of Rolph and Naples would also be included in the proposed NCD. (See Exhibit D for map of proposed zoning.)
- Institute maximum parking controls within the Outer Mission Street NCD, as outlined under Section 151.1. Parking would be capped at one parking space per dwelling unit. Commercial uses would have the standard parking maximums outlined in Planning Code Section 151.1
- Remove the Excelsior Alcohol Restricted Use District, but preserve the prohibition on new liquor stores in the proposed NCD. Grocery stores would be permitted to have off-sale alcohol licenses.
- Maintain the prohibition on Fringe Financial Services in the proposed NCD.
- Provide a five foot height bonus for properties zoned 40-X and 50-X for the entire district.
- Institute a 500 foot buffer between MCDs.

ISSUES AND CONSIDERATIONS

General NC and Named Neighborhood Commercial Districts

NC-1 Districts are intended to serve as local neighborhood shopping districts, providing convenience retail goods and services for the immediately surrounding neighborhoods primarily during daytime hours. NC-1 Districts are characterized by their location in residential neighborhoods, often these districts consist of a small cluster of ground floor commercial uses in an otherwise residential area of the City. The commercial intensity of these districts varies. Many of these districts have the lowest intensity of commercial development in the City, generally consisting of small clusters with three or more commercial establishments, commonly grouped around a corner; and in some cases short linear commercial strips with low-scale, interspersed mixed-use (residential-commercial) development.

NC-2 Districts are intended to serve as the City's Small-Scale Neighborhood Commercial District. These districts are linear shopping streets that provide convenience goods and services to the surrounding neighborhoods as well as limited comparison shopping goods for a wider market. The range of goods and services offered is varied and often includes specialty retail stores, restaurants, and neighborhood-serving offices. NC-2 Districts are commonly located along both collector and arterial streets which have transit routes. These districts range in size from two or three blocks to many blocks, although the commercial development in longer districts may be interspersed with housing or other land uses.

NC-3 Districts are intended in most cases to offer a wide variety of comparison and specialty goods and services to a population greater than the immediate neighborhood, additionally providing convenience

goods and services to the surrounding neighborhoods. NC-3 Districts are linear districts located along heavily trafficked thoroughfares which also serve as major transit routes. NC-3 Districts include some of the longest linear commercial streets in the City, some of which have continuous retail development for many blocks. Large-scale lots and buildings and wide streets distinguish the districts from smaller-scaled commercial streets, although the districts may include small as well as moderately scaled lots. Buildings typically range in height from two to four stories with occasional taller structures.

Named Commercial Districts are generally of the same scale and intensity as NC-2 Districts; however this proposed NCD has controls similar to NC-3 Districts. There are currently 27 named NCDs in the City. Some of the oldest named NCDs in the City include the Broadway, Castro, Upper Fillmore, Haight and Inner and Outer Clement NCDs, and there is a trend to create more individually named NCDs throughout the City. These types of districts allow for more tailored controls and help to protect or enhance unique characteristics associated with a neighborhood. Changes that are made to a named commercial district only apply to that district, whereas changes made to NC-1, NC-2 and NC-3 Districts apply citywide. For example, if a named NCD wants to control the number of nail salons because of a perceived overconcentration, then the controls for that named NCD can be changed to prohibit or require Conditional Use authorization for Personal Service uses. Conversely, if a neighborhood wants to encourage a type of use, the controls for that named NCD can be changed so that use is principally permitted.

Alcohol Restricted Use District and Fringe Financial Services Restricted Use Districts

The Excelsior Alcohol RUD and the Fringe Financial Services RUD were added to this stretch of Mission Street because of community concern over an over-concentration of liquor stores and check cashing stores. Because this area was zoned as a general zoning district, NC-2 and NC-3, Liquor Stores and Fringe Financial Services could not be prohibited outright without changing the zoning for all NC-2 and NC-3 Districts throughout the City. If this stretch of Mission Street has its own named NCD, the RUDs are no longer needed to control for the over proliferation of these two uses.

NCD Height Controls

San Francisco's commercial height districts tend to be base ten numbers such as 40, 50, etc. These base ten districts may lead to buildings that are similar in height to the neighboring buildings but that are lesser in human comfort than buildings of similar scale built prior to the City's height limits. This is due to the desire to maximize the number of stories in new projects. Recent community planning efforts have highlighted some failings of these base 10 height districts. The 2008 Market & Octavia¹ and Eastern Neighborhoods² Plans recognize that the base ten height limits in neighborhood commercial districts often encourage inferior architecture. For this reason, both of these plans sought to encourage more active and attractive ground floor space by giving a five foot height bonus to buildings which meet the definition of "active ground floor" use. This five foot increase must be used for adding more space to the ground floor.

¹ Ord. 72-08, File No. 071157, App. 4/3/2008.

² Ord. 297-08, 298-08, 299-08 and 300-08, App. 12/19/2008.

In 2008, Supervisor Sandoval sponsored a similar text amendment that extended this height increase outside of established plan areas to provide for a maximum five foot special height exception for active ground floor uses in the NC-2 and NC-3 designated parcels fronting portions of Mission Street³. Another amendment introduced by Supervisor Avalos in 2009 that now allows a maximum five foot height increase in certain NC-1 parcels in District 11⁴. Most recently, Geary Boulevard, Inner Clement, Outer Clement, the new Outer Sunset NCDs, 24th-Noe Street NCD and NC-2 zoned portions of Balboa Street were added to the list of zoning districts that allow the 5' height bonus.

The proposed Ordinance would not allow an additional floor to new projects. A 40-X and 50-X height limit can accommodate a maximum of four and five floors, respectively. Since the additional five foot height can only be used on the ground floor, the height limit still can only accommodate the same number of floors.

Density

The proposed Outer Mission Street NCD will have the same density controls as those in NC-3 District. RH-1, NC-1 and NC-2 zoning districts all have lower densities than NC-3 district. RH-1 density is basically one dwelling unit per lot, while NC-1 and NC-2 districts allow 1 dwelling unit per 800 sq. ft. of lot area. NC-3 Districts permit 1 dwelling unit per 600 sq. ft. of lot area. On a typical 2,500 sq. ft. lot a property that was previously zoned NC-1 or NC-2 would have been permitted to have 3 dwelling units; under the proposed zoning these properties would be permitted to have 4 dwelling units. The surrounding area of the proposed NCD has a very low density. Most of the lots are zoned RH-1 (single-family) and RH-2 (two-family). Further, Mission Street is a major transit corridor and the General Plan calls for adding housing near transit (Housing Element, Policy 13.1), and encouraging housing that relies on transit use (Housing Element, Policy 12.1).

MCDs

Based on the Potential MCD Locations Map prepared by the Planning Department in 2010, there are three areas within the proposed NCD that contain potential sites for MCDs⁵; around Mission Street between Alemany Boulevard and Silver Avenue toward the north of the proposed NCD, around the intersection of Mission Street and Geneva Avenue in the middle of the proposed NCD, and around the intersection of Mission and Sickles Avenue at the south end of the proposed NCD. (See exhibit E for map.) Already there are three MCDs in the proposed NCD, one toward the north end of the proposed NCD at 4218 Mission Street, and two in the middle of the proposed NCD at 5234 Mission St, and 5258 Mission St. A 500' buffer would potentially limit the establishment of additional MCDs in the proposed NCD toward its southern end.

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.

³ Ord. 321-08, File no. 081100, App. 12/19/2008.

⁴ Ord. 5-10, File No. 090319, App. 1/22/2010

⁵ The MCD map prepared by the Planning Department shows areas that are (1) zoned to allow new MCDs and (2) not located within 1000' of a School. The map does not indicate uses which further restrict MCD locations including (1) community facilities, (2) recreation buildings and (3) substance abuse treatment centers.

RECOMMENDATION

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

1. Under the list of NC-1 parcels included in the proposed NCD change 5405 to 6405.
2. Move Blocks 6802 and 6803 from the list of NC-3 parcels included in the proposed NCD to the list of NC-2 parcels included in the proposed NCD.
3. Add The Outer Mission Street NCD to the list of Zoning Districts in Section 201
4. Modify Section 263.20 per the changes outlined in Exhibit F
5. Remove the Excelsior Alcohol SUD from table 702.3

BASIS FOR RECOMMENDATION

The Department supports creating an individually named neighborhood commercial district for the Outer Mission Neighborhood because named NCDs help to preserve and enhance the character of a neighborhood and they also help create a sense of identity. Alcohol restrictions and fringe financial restrictions have been implemented in this neighborhood in response to an over proliferation of both in the area. Creating a new named NCD for this area will allow these restricted use districts to be removed from the Planning Code, exchanging cumbersome overlays with more targeted controls.

Parking Maximums

The Department supports the removal of the parking minimums because it is consistent with the City's Transit First policy, the General Plan and because it will help increase the supply of housing in the City. A recent study done by Michael Manville at UCLA found that there is a strong correlation between the elimination of parking mandates and increase housing supply⁶. The study found that when parking requirements are removed, developers provide more housing and less parking, and also that developers provide different types of housing: housing in older buildings, in previously disinvested areas, and housing marketed toward non-drivers. Minimum parking requirements result in more space being dedicated to parking than is really needed; height limits, setback requirements, open space requirements and other development regulations leave less space for actual housing units. Further, because of the active street frontage requirements in the Planning Code, parking in newer buildings is typically provided underground, and underground parking spaces are expensive costing between \$30,000 and \$50,000 each or more. Developers recoup those costs by including it in the cost of housing.

Increase Density

The Department also supports the modest increase in density that will occur for properties not currently zoned NC-3 because it will help add to the City's housing stock and encourage the creation of more affordable housing units. The neighborhoods surrounding the proposed NCD have an extremely low density, with the majority of properties zoned RH-1 (single-family) or RH-2 (two-family). Compared to this type of low-density housing, multifamily housing consumes less material per unit to build, uses less land, is more energy efficient, and requires less utility infrastructure. While increasing supply does not

⁶ http://www.its.ucla.edu/research/rpubs/manville_aro_dec_2010.pdf

guarantee affordability for everyone or even that prices will see a net drop, more housing supply will drive prices lower than they would have been absent that increased supply, and that helps affordability across the board. Further, increasing the density along Mission Street, a major transit corridor, places the density in the most appropriate location and helps to bring more activity and vitality to the commercial corridor.

MCD Restrictions

The Department supports the 500 foot buffer for MCDs in the proposed NCD because it will help prevent clustering of MCDs in the neighborhood while not prohibiting them outright. As with all land uses, an over concentration of any one use erodes the vibrancy and economic diversity of a neighborhood. MCDs are unique in that there are only so many areas of the City where they are allowed to locate, and this neighborhood has three areas of a significant size that allow MCDs. As detailed above, three MCDs have already moved into the neighborhood. The proposed 500 foot buffer will help ensure that there isn't an over concentration of MCDs, but still allow for this vital service to be located within other areas of the proposed NCD.

Discontiguous District

The proposed NCD includes an existing NC-1 district that is located less than a ¼ mile from the main portion of the proposed NCD. While this portion of the NCD is discontiguous with the rest of the district, the Department supports its inclusion because it is so close to the main portion of the proposed NCD, sharing similar land use concerns such as the over proliferation of liquor stores and fringe financial stores. MCDs are not permitted in this area already because of its close proximity to a school. Further, as mentioned above the density increase is a modest increase and will help add to the City's housing stock and encourage the creation of more affordable housing units.

Recommendations 1-2

These recommendations are intended to fix minor errors in the Ordinance. They have been vetted with the Supervisor Avalos's office and do not change the intended boundaries of the proposed district.

Recommendations 3-5

These recommendations are clerical in nature and do not affect the proposed District.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

The proposal ordinance would result in no physical impact on the environment. The Project was determined to be exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA") under the General Rule Exclusion (CEQA Guidelines Section 15061(b)(3)) as described in the determination contained in the Planning Department files for this Project.

PUBLIC COMMENT

As of the date of this report, the Planning Department has received a few inquiries about the proposed NCD, but no statements of support or opposition.

RECOMMENDATION: Recommendation of Approval with Modification

Attachments:

- Exhibit A: Draft Planning Commission Resolution
- Exhibit B: Board of Supervisors File No. 120796
- Exhibit C: Map of Existing Zoning
- Exhibit D: Map of Proposed Zoning
- Exhibit E: Map of Potential MCD sites
- Exhibit F: Clerical changes to Section 263.20
- Exhibit G: Environmental Determination

Exhibit F

263.20

(a) Intent. In order to encourage generous ground floor ceiling heights for commercial and other active uses, encourage additional light and air into ground floor spaces, allow for walk-up ground floor residential uses to be raised slightly from sidewalk level for privacy and usability of front stoops, and create better building frontage on the public street, up to an additional 5' of height is allowed along major streets in NCT districts, or in specific districts listed below, for buildings that feature either higher ground floor ceilings for non-residential uses or ground floor residential units (that have direct walk-up access from the sidewalk) raised up from sidewalk level.

(b) Applicability. The special height exception described in this section shall only apply to projects that meet all of the following criteria:

(1) project is located in a 30-X, 40-X or 50-X Height and Bulk District as designated on the Zoning Map;

(2) project is located in one of the following Districts:

(A) in an NCT district as designated on the Zoning Map;

(B) in the Upper Market Street, Inner Clement Street, Outer Clement Street, Irving Street, Taraval Street, Noriega Street, Judah Street, 24th Street- Noe Valley, Divisadero Street, Outer Mission Street, and Fillmore Street NCDs;

(C) ~~on a NC-2 or NC-3 designated parcel fronting Mission Street, from Silver Avenue to the Daly City border;~~

~~(D)~~ on a NC-2 designated parcel on Balboa Street between 2nd Avenue and 8th Avenue, and between 32nd Avenue and 39th Avenue;

~~(E)~~ (D) on a NC-1 designated parcel within the boundaries of Sargent Street to Orizaba Avenue to Lobos Street to Plymouth Avenue to Farallones Street to San Jose Avenue to Alemany Boulevard to 19th Avenue to Randolph Street to Monticello Street and back to Sargent Street; or

~~(F)~~ (E) on a NC-3 designated parcel fronting on Geary Boulevard from Masonic Avenue to 28th Avenue, except for parcels on the north side of Geary Boulevard between Palm Avenue and Parker Avenue;

~~(G)~~ (F) on a parcel zoned NC-1 ~~or NC-2 with a commercial use on the ground floor~~ on Noriega, Irving, Taraval, or Judah Streets west of 19th Avenue;

~~(H)~~ on a parcel zoned NC-1 or NC-2 with a commercial use on the ground floor on Irving Street west of 19th Avenue;

~~(I) on a parcel zoned NC-1 or NC-2 with a commercial use on the ground floor on Taraval Street west of 19th Avenue;~~

~~(J) on a parcel zoned NC-1 or NC-2 with a commercial use on the ground floor on Judah Street west of 19th Avenue;~~

(3) project features ground floor commercial space or other active use as defined by Section 145.1(b)(2) with clear ceiling heights in excess of ten feet from sidewalk grade, or in the case of residential uses, such walk-up residential units are raised up from sidewalk level;

(4) said ground floor commercial space, active use, or walk-up residential use is primarily oriented along a right-of-way wider than 40 feet;

(5) said ground floor commercial space or active use occupies at least 50% of the project's ground floor area; and

(6) except for projects located in NCT districts, the project sponsor has conclusively demonstrated that the additional 5' increment allowed through Section 263.20 would not add new shadow to any public open spaces.

(c) One additional foot of height, up to a total of five feet, shall be permitted above the designated height limit for each additional foot of ground floor clear ceiling height in excess of 10 feet from sidewalk grade, or in the case of residential units, for each foot the unit is raised above sidewalk grade.

130084



EDWIN M. LEE
MAYOR

**POLICE DEPARTMENT
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO**

THOMAS J. CAHILL HALL OF JUSTICE
850 BRYANT STREET
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94103-4603



GREGORY P. SUHR
CHIEF OF POLICE

February 20, 2013

Ms. Alisa Miller, Clerk
Land Use & Economic Development Committee
Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102-4694

Dear Ms. Miller:

RE: File No. 130084 – Update Planning. Zoning Map – Establishing Outer Mission Street
Neighborhood Commercial District

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2013 FEB 22 AM 10:17
BY *MLL*

In reviewing the proposed legislation, the Police Department's primary concern is that the ordinance seeks to make permanent the Excelsior Alcohol Restricted Use District's restrictions on off-site liquor sales locations.

While the SFPD fully supports that idea, the language in the new and old ordinance is slightly different. The new ordinance reads, "New Liquor Store uses are not permitted in the district" (Page 10 of revised as of 2/7/13 version). The older version (Page 28 of revised as of 2/7/13 version) read, "No new liquor establishments selling alcoholic beverages for off-site consumption shall be permitted in the Excelsior Alcohol RUD." This seemed far more specific.

Staff recommends the section read, "New Type 20 and Type 21 ABC Licenses are not permitted in the District." This would prevent any new business that sells alcoholic beverages for off-site consumption from entering the area.

Staff from our Ingleside District Station spoke to representatives of the larger community organizations in the area about the proposed legislation. Their specific concerns were regarding the restrictions proposed on Medical Cannabis Dispensaries (MCD). They felt MCDs should be more than 500 feet apart from each other, be further away from schools than the current 1,000 feet, and have fewer operating hours.

The SFPD is in agreement that there are issues regarding the allowable space between MCDs. The current requirement of 500 feet is roughly one city block. The SFPD would prefer it to be 1,000 feet apart to avoid having two dispensaries within the same block not only due to the nature of the business, but also because of the amount of loitering and double-parking of vehicles around these locations.

If we can be of further assistance, please feel free to contact my office.

Sincerely,

Greg P. Suhr
GREGORY P. SUHR
Chief of Police

tf/cf



SMALL BUSINESS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SMALL BUSINESS



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

April 17, 2013

Ms. Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board
Board of Supervisors
City Hall room 244
1 Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102-4694

File No. 130084 [Planning Code, Zoning Map - Establishing Outer Mission Street Neighborhood Commercial District]

Small Business Commission Recommendation: **Approval with modification**

Dear Ms. Calvillo:

On March 11, 2013 the Small Business Commission (SBC) voted 7-0 to recommend approval of BOS File No. 130084.

The Commission recognizes that the Outer Mission Street commercial corridor has matured over the past decade and an appropriate next step in furthering the development of the corridor is introducing individualized zoning controls. The SBC has reviewed the proposed changes, and finds that this ordinance will benefit the commercial corridor and small businesses along this part of Mission Street.

One of the most significant changes ordinance makes is the abolishment of the Excelsior Alcohol Restricted Use District. This district currently prohibits all off-sale liquor licenses. As controls are transitioned to the new Neighborhood Commercial District (NCD), language is being included to prohibit new liquor stores, while permitting off-sale alcohol at grocery stores and specialty grocery stores, under threshold limitations prescribed in the Planning Code. The Commission supports this policy decision by the Supervisor and recognizes that an outright ban of all off-sale liquor licenses does restrict desirable businesses, in this case grocery stores and specialty grocery stores from locating to the corridor. The SBC observes that there are additional processes that take place before off-sale liquor licenses are approved, including ABC approval and Board of Supervisor Public Necessity and Convenience authorization in areas of high license concentration and/or crime.

All named NC districts have operating hour restrictions, which require a Conditional Use Authorization for operating hours generally between 2a.m. and 6a.m. The Commission finds that this provision helps protect public safety and assists in attracting and retaining desirable businesses in our commercial corridors. Therefore, the SBC recommends that section 745.27 ordinance be amended to adopt operating hour restrictions to require a CU between 2a.m. and 6a.m.

The Commission, in recommending approval with modification, continues to support the creation of named NCD's and backs efforts to further create identities in our commercial corridors.

Moving forward, expect the SBC in future discussions on Alcohol Restricted Use Districts to note that some liquor stores may be desirable, including wine stores and boutique beer stores which may be

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



SMALL BUSINESS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SMALL BUSINESS



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

prohibited from being considered under RUD's, while stores that have created the need for these types of restrictions will continue to operate without any competition or incentive to change business practices. In general, the Commission supports Conditional Use as a preferred option to control the creation of new liquor uses. This allows, on a case by case basis, for new uses to be considered, when appropriate.

Sincerely,

Regina Dick-Endrizzi
Director, Office of Small Business

Cc: Supervisor Avalos
Aaron Starr, Planning Department
Jason Elliot, Mayor's Office

From: Board of Supervisors
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: File 130084: 10 new signers: Camille Alfaro-Martell, lyn mesias...

From: Terry Zhang [mailto:mail@changemail.org]
Sent: Thursday, October 17, 2013 1:53 AM
To: Board of Supervisors
Subject: 10 new signers: Camille Alfaro-Martell, lyn mesias...

10 new people recently signed Ney Street Neighborhood Watch's petition "[Tell Mayor Lee and Chief Suhr We Need More Than One Foot Patrol Officer in the Excelsior](#)" on Change.org.

There are now 260 signatures on this petition. Read reasons why people are signing, and respond to Ney Street Neighborhood Watch by clicking here:

<http://www.change.org/petitions/tell-mayor-lee-and-chief-suhr-we-need-more-than-one-foot-patrol-officer-in-the-excelsior/responses/new?response=9272c59f571d>

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

Immediately put additional experienced foot patrol officers on Mission Street from Trumbull to beyond Geneva to Mt. Vernon Street. Currently there is only one officer between Silver Avenue and Geneva – a 1.25 miles patrol area.

Sincerely,

- 252. Camille Alfaro-Martell Colma, California
- 253. lyn mesias san francisco, California
- 254. Jeanne Crawford San Francisco, California
- 255. Josie Kirton San Francisco, California
- 255. Holly Bowling San Francisco, California
- 256. Jeremy Hoffman San Francisco, California
- 257. Kristen Oliver San Francisco, California
- 258. Laura Perez San Francisco, California
- 259. Jenn Rosenberg San Francisco, California
- 260. Terry Zhang San Francisco, California

File 130084

From: Catherine Consiglieri [mailto:changemail.org]
Sent: Tuesday, October 15, 2013 7:13 PM
To: Board of Supervisors
Subject: 5 new petition signatures: Tracy McGillis, David ISBISTER...

5 new people recently signed Ney Street Neighborhood Watch's petition "Tell Mayor Lee and Chief Suhr We Need More Than One Foot Patrol Officer in the Excelsior" on Change.org.

There are now 204 signatures on this petition. Read reasons why people are signing, and respond to Ney Street Neighborhood Watch by clicking here:

<http://www.change.org/petitions/tell-mayor-lee-and-chief-suhr-we-need-more-than-one-foot-patrol-officer-in-the-excelsior/responses/new?response=9272c59f571d>

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

Immediately put additional experienced foot patrol officers on Mission Street from Trumbull to beyond Geneva to Mt. Vernon Street. Currently there is only one officer between Silver Avenue and Geneva – a 1.25 miles patrol area.

Sincerely,

- 161. Tracy McGillis San Francisco, California
- 162. David ISBISTER SAN FRANCISCO, California
- 163. Katherine Menchaca San Francisco, California
- 164. Emily Canney San Francisco, California
- 165. Catherine Consiglieri San Francisco, California

From: Ethan Karson [mailto:changemail.org]
Sent: Tuesday, October 15, 2013 7:39 PM
To: Board of Supervisors
Subject: 5 new petition signatures: Simon Thorpe, Denise Ruggeri...

5 new people recently signed Ney Street Neighborhood Watch's petition "[Tell Mayor Lee and Chief Suhr We Need More Than One Foot Patrol Officer in the Excelsior](#)" on Change.org.

There are now 204 signatures on this petition. Read reasons why people are signing, and respond to Ney Street Neighborhood Watch by clicking here:

<http://www.change.org/petitions/tell-mayor-lee-and-chief-suhr-we-need-more-than-one-foot-patrol-officer-in-the-excelsior/responses/new?response=9272c59f571d>

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

Immediately put additional experienced foot patrol officers on Mission Street from Trumbull to beyond Geneva to Mt. Vernon Street. Currently there is only one officer between Silver Avenue and Geneva – a 1.25 miles patrol area.

Sincerely,

- 166. Simon Thorpe San Francisco, California
- 167. Denise Ruggeri San Francisco, California
- 168. Carol Fahey San Francisco, California
- 169. Corinne Benson San Francisco, California
- 170. Ethan Karson San Francisco, California

From: Tara Robinson [mailto:changemail.org]
Sent: Tuesday, October 15, 2013 8:08 PM
To: Board of Supervisors
Subject: 5 new petition signatures: RICHARD CANATELLA, Matt Holzer...

5 new people recently signed Ney Street Neighborhood Watch's petition "[Tell Mayor Lee and Chief Suhr We Need More Than One Foot Patrol Officer in the Excelsior](#)" on Change.org.

There are now 211 signatures on this petition. Read reasons why people are signing, and respond to Ney Street Neighborhood Watch by clicking here:

<http://www.change.org/petitions/tell-mayor-lee-and-chief-suhr-we-need-more-than-one-foot-patrol-officer-in-the-excelsior/responses/new?response=9272c59f571d>

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

Immediately put additional experienced foot patrol officers on Mission Street from Trumbull to beyond Geneva to Mt. Vernon Street. Currently there is only one officer between Silver Avenue and Geneva – a 1.25 miles patrol area.

Sincerely,

- 171. RICHARD CANATELLA San Francisco, California
- 172. Matt Holzer San Francisco, California
- 173. Melissa Trousdale San Francisco, California
- 174. Maggie Fahey San Francisco, California
- 175. Tara Robinson San Francisco, California

From: Melissa Arellanes [mailto:changemail.org]
Sent: Tuesday, October 15, 2013 8:44 PM
To: Board of Supervisors
Subject: 5 new petition signatures: Serena Yu, Kristen Tate...

5 new people recently signed Ney Street Neighborhood Watch's petition "[Tell Mayor Lee and Chief Suhr We Need More Than One Foot Patrol Officer in the Excelsior](#)" on Change.org.

There are now 215 signatures on this petition. Read reasons why people are signing, and respond to Ney Street Neighborhood Watch by clicking here:

<http://www.change.org/petitions/tell-mayor-lee-and-chief-suhr-we-need-more-than-one-foot-patrol-officer-in-the-excelsior/responses/new?response=9272c59f571d>

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

Immediately put additional experienced foot patrol officers on Mission Street from Trumbull to beyond Geneva to Mt. Vernon Street. Currently there is only one officer between Silver Avenue and Geneva – a 1.25 miles patrol area.

Sincerely,

- 176. Serena Yu San Francisco, California
- 177. Kristen Tate San Francisco, California
- 178. Marianne Grech San Francisco, California
- 179. Jennifer Gette San Francisco, California
- 180. Melissa Arellanes San Francisco, California

From: Jeanette Lee [mailto:changemail.org]
Sent: Tuesday, October 15, 2013 8:53 PM
To: Board of Supervisors
Subject: 5 new petition signatures: Rhea St. Julien, Donald Brenner...

5 new people recently signed Ney Street Neighborhood Watch's petition "[Tell Mayor Lee and Chief Suhr We Need More Than One Foot Patrol Officer in the Excelsior](#)" on Change.org.

There are now 217 signatures on this petition. Read reasons why people are signing, and respond to Ney Street Neighborhood Watch by clicking here:

<http://www.change.org/petitions/tell-mayor-lee-and-chief-suhr-we-need-more-than-one-foot-patrol-officer-in-the-excelsior/responses/new?response=9272c59f571d>

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

Immediately put additional experienced foot patrol officers on Mission Street from Trumbull to beyond Geneva to Mt. Vernon Street. Currently there is only one officer between Silver Avenue and Geneva – a 1.25 miles patrol area.

Sincerely,

181. Rhea St. Julien San Francisco, California
182. Donald Brenner san francisco, California
183. Clarissa Kalman San Francisco, California
184. Phuong Chau San Francisco, California
185. Jeanette Lee San francisco, California

From: Chester Rhoan [mailto:changemail.org]
Sent: Tuesday, October 15, 2013 9:21 PM
To: Board of Supervisors
Subject: 5 new petition signatures: Laurie Heath, Tim Adams...

5 new people recently signed Ney Street Neighborhood Watch's petition "[Tell Mayor Lee and Chief Suhr We Need More Than One Foot Patrol Officer in the Excelsior](#)" on Change.org.

There are now 222 signatures on this petition. Read reasons why people are signing, and respond to Ney Street Neighborhood Watch by clicking here:

<http://www.change.org/petitions/tell-mayor-lee-and-chief-suhr-we-need-more-than-one-foot-patrol-officer-in-the-excelsior/responses/new?response=9272c59f571d>

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

Immediately put additional experienced foot patrol officers on Mission Street from Trumbull to beyond Geneva to Mt. Vernon Street. Currently there is only one officer between Silver Avenue and Geneva – a 1.25 miles patrol area.

Sincerely,

191. Laurie Heath San Francisco, California
192. Tim Adams San Francisco, California
193. Maureen Minn San Francisco, California
194. Jean Francois HOUDRE SF, California
195. Chester Rhoan San Francisco, California

From: Paulann Sternberg [mailto:changemail.org]
Sent: Wednesday, October 16, 2013 3:32 AM
To: Board of Supervisors
Subject: 5 new petition signatures: Wesley Huang, Sean Ingram...

5 new people recently signed Ney Street Neighborhood Watch's petition "[Tell Mayor Lee and Chief Suhr We Need More Than One Foot Patrol Officer in the Excelsior](#)" on Change.org.

There are now 230 signatures on this petition. Read reasons why people are signing, and respond to Ney Street Neighborhood Watch by clicking here:

<http://www.change.org/petitions/tell-mayor-lee-and-chief-suhr-we-need-more-than-one-foot-patrol-officer-in-the-excelsior/responses/new?response=9272c59f571d>

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

Immediately put additional experienced foot patrol officers on Mission Street from Trumbull to beyond Geneva to Mt. Vernon Street. Currently there is only one officer between Silver Avenue and Geneva – a 1.25 miles patrol area.

Sincerely,

- 226. Wesley Huang 舊金山, California
- 227. Sean Ingram San Francisco, California
- 228. Jeannette Maysenhalder San Francisco, California
- 229. Mitch Lopez San Francisco, California
- 230. Paulann Sternberg San Francisco, California

From: Board of Supervisors
To: ~~BOS-Supervisors~~
Subject: File 130084: 5 new petition signatures: sara deseran, Ross Morrison...

From: Noemi Johansson-Miller [mailto:mail@changemail.org]
Sent: Wednesday, October 16, 2013 1:21 PM
To: Board of Supervisors
Subject: 5 new petition signatures: sara deseran, Ross Morrison...

5 new people recently signed Ney Street Neighborhood Watch's petition "Tell Mayor Lee and Chief Suhr We Need More Than One Foot Patrol Officer in the Excelsior" on Change.org.

There are now 243 signatures on this petition. Read reasons why people are signing, and respond to Ney Street Neighborhood Watch by clicking here:

<http://www.change.org/petitions/tell-mayor-lee-and-chief-suhr-we-need-more-than-one-foot-patrol-officer-in-the-excelsior/responses/new?response=9272c59f571d>

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

Immediately put additional experienced foot patrol officers on Mission Street from Trumbull to beyond Geneva to Mt. Vernon Street. Currently there is only one officer between Silver Avenue and Geneva – a 1.25 miles patrol area.

Sincerely,

- 231. sara deseran san francisco, California
- 232. Ross Morrison San Francisco, California
- 233. Monica Guzman San Francisco, California
- 234. Anthony Alfonso San Francisco, California
- 235. Noemi Johansson-Miller San Francisco, California

From: Julie Hanh [mailto:changemail.org]
Sent: Wednesday, October 16, 2013 5:06 PM
To: Board of Supervisors
Subject: 5 new petition signatures: colby choi, Rocio Barraza...

5 new people recently signed Ney Street Neighborhood Watch's petition "[Tell Mayor Lee and Chief Suhr We Need More Than One Foot Patrol Officer in the Excelsior](#)" on Change.org.

There are now 255 signatures on this petition. Read reasons why people are signing, and respond to Ney Street Neighborhood Watch by clicking here:

<http://www.change.org/petitions/tell-mayor-lee-and-chief-suhr-we-need-more-than-one-foot-patrol-officer-in-the-excelsior/responses/new?response=9272c59f571d>

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

Immediately put additional experienced foot patrol officers on Mission Street from Trumbull to beyond Geneva to Mt. Vernon Street. Currently there is only one officer between Silver Avenue and Geneva – a 1.25 miles patrol area.

Sincerely,

- 241. colby choi San Francisco, California
- 242. Rocio Barraza San Francisco, California
- 243. mark rodriguez sf, California
- 244. David Mui San Francisco, California
- 245. Julie Hanh San Francisco, California

Ⓜ

From: Teresa Prothero [mailto:changemail.org]
Sent: Wednesday, October 16, 2013 5:22 PM
To: Board of Supervisors
Subject: 5 new petition signatures: Josie Shrader, Tami Rowan...

5 new people recently signed Ney Street Neighborhood Watch's petition "[Tell Mayor Lee and Chief Suhr We Need More Than One Foot Patrol Officer in the Excelsior](#)" on Change.org.

There are now 255 signatures on this petition. Read reasons why people are signing, and respond to Ney Street Neighborhood Watch by clicking here:

<http://www.change.org/petitions/tell-mayor-lee-and-chief-suhr-we-need-more-than-one-foot-patrol-officer-in-the-excelsior/responses/new?response=9272c59f571d>

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

Immediately put additional experienced foot patrol officers on Mission Street from Trumbull to beyond Geneva to Mt. Vernon Street. Currently there is only one officer between Silver Avenue and Geneva – a 1.25 miles patrol area.

Sincerely,

- 246. Josie Shrader San Francisco, California
- 247. Tami Rowan San Francisco, California
- 248. Denise Bonilla San Francisco, California
- 249. Erik Finne San Francisco, California
- 250. Teresa Prothero San Francisco, California

Miller, Alisa

From: Board of Supervisors
Sent: Tuesday, October 15, 2013 5:28 PM
To: BOS-Supervisors; Miller, Alisa
Subject: File 130084: MCD's, Illegal Gambling, and Beat Cops in the Excelsior

From: Patricia De Fonte [mailto:patricia_defonte@yahoo.com]
Sent: Tuesday, October 15, 2013 11:22 AM
To: Avalos, John; Rahaim, John; Lee, Mayor; doug_vu@sfgov.org; Tavakoli, Shahde; Falvey, Timothy; Board of Supervisors
Cc: Ney Street Neighborhood Watch
Subject: MCD's, Illegal Gambling, and Beat Cops in the Excelsior

Dear Mr. Rahaim, San Francisco Supervisors and Mayor Lee,

I have been a resident of the Excelsior since 2008, and live in a home owned by my husband's family since the 1950's. I have two young children and they will grow up in the Excelsior.

I am the block captain of San Francisco's largest and award winning Ney Street Neighborhood Watch and have worked tirelessly and relentlessly to improve my Neighborhood in the past few years.

While my Neighbors and I have planted trees, painted fences, written (and won) beautification grants, educated residents on personal and residential safety, worked with DPW and other City agencies to clean up filthy and neglected commercial interests and private property, the City of San Francisco has permitted the Excelsior commercial corridor to become a dangerous, filthy place sorely lacking in services residents want and need.

I am writing to you to make three points:

1. No further MCD's should be approved until John Avalos' proposed anti-clustering legislation is finalized. We have one pot club between Silver and Trumbull, there is no valid reason for opening another one within 1000 feet of that club. We need a mix of businesses - and two pot clubs within 400 feet of each other will stifle further economic development - who will open a coffee shop or deli or pet store or book store near two pot clubs with security guards hanging around outside all day? Who will install a parklet near two pot clubs?
2. The "internet" cafes which are actually gambling halls need to be shut down. The full force of the law must be brought against the property owners and the business owners. These types of businesses can destroy our neighborhood because, again, who in their right mind would open a normal business next door to NetStop or anything like NetStop? Residents are afraid to walk past that store, and it is bringing crime and strife to the Excelsior.
3. The lack of foot patrol officers on Mission Street has been inexcusable for a very long time. On October 9th at 4pm it became crystal clear that people with guns feel perfectly at ease committing murder in broad daylight in front of children in the heart of the Excelsior. This situation cannot be tolerated for one more day.

NSNW has been told multiple times by Ingleside SFPD that due to large numbers of retiring officers that they do not have the manpower to place more than one officer between Mt. Vernon and Silver Avenue, and that when the new officers coming out of the police academy are placed on foot patrol they will be "green" and it will take them a while to learn the ropes. We don't have the luxury of time - please support Captain Falvey

and Ingleside SFPD and get them the experienced officers they need to provide my community with sufficient numbers of experienced police officers. We need increased foot patrols between Trumbull Street to Ms. Vernon Street (just past Geneva).

* * *

If the City of San Francisco is going to permit unlimited numbers of MCDs and internet gambling halls to operate in the Excelsior then the City of San Francisco can consider itself the cause of the destruction of this blue collar, hard working, traditional residential district. If the City of San Francisco does not take immediate action to put seasoned police officers on sufficient foot patrols this will send a message that violent crime is permissible on Mission Street in the Excelsior. I urge you to act quickly and in the best interests of the residents and voters of District 11.

I look forward to all opportunities to discuss these matters - whether in town halls meetings, BOS meetings or otherwise.

Patricia De Fonte,
Excelsior Resident and Voter

CC:
Director John Rahaim, The San Francisco Planning Commission John.rahaim@sfgov.org
Supervisor John Avalos john.avalos@sfgov.org
Shahde Tavakoli Shahde Office of Mayor Edwin M. Lee Tavakoli@sfgov.org
Doug Vu, Planning Dept. Staff overseeing the Lucky Dragon MCD planned for 4130 Mission Street,
doug_vu@sfgov.org
Mayor Ed Lee, mayoredwinlee@sfgov.org
Captain Timothy Falvey, Ingleside SFPD, timothy.falvey@sfgov.org
San Francisco Board of Supervisors, board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

Miller, Alisa

From: Board of Supervisors
Sent: Tuesday, October 15, 2013 5:29 PM
To: BOS-Supervisors; Miller, Alisa
Subject: File 130084: [neystreetnw] MCD's, Illegal Gambling, and Beat Cops in the Excelsior

From: Mariana Carrillo [mailto:marianascp83@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, October 15, 2013 12:08 PM
To: Patricia De Fonte
Cc: Tavakoli, Shahde; Lee, Mayor; Avalos, John; doug_vu@sfgov.org; Ney Street Neighborhood Watch; Board of Supervisors; Falvey, Timothy; Rahaim, John
Subject: Re: [neystreetnw] MCD's, Illegal Gambling, and Beat Cops in the Excelsior

Hi I live in the neybor with my family too, and this is our first year here, I am also very concern about what happened last week, and I wanted to add that the week before on Monday around 9am I could hear lound sound which I didn't know were gunshot until the next morning while playing in the back yard with my kids, I could see police officers on Trumbull st and asked what happend, that morning I could see 3 young guys walking by giving hi fives and celebrating after the gunshots, it could be them I don't know but if were them they look proud and happy about what had happened they know theres no police around and they can do watever they want in our neybor wich is unacceptable, since we have family and kids just like mine playing in backyards and shouldn't witness anything like this.

On Oct 15, 2013 11:21 AM, "Patricia De Fonte" <patricia_defonte@yahoo.com> wrote:

Dear Mr. Rahaim, San Francisco Supervisors and Mayor Lee,

I have been a resident of the Excelsior since 2008, and live in a home owned by my husband's family since the 1950's. I have two young children and they will grow up in the Excelsior.

I am the block captain of San Francisco's largest and award winning Ney Street Neighborhood Watch and have worked tirelessly and relentlessly to improve my Neyborhood in the past few years.

While my Neybors and I have planted trees, painted fences, written (and won) beautification grants, educated residents on personal and residential safety, worked with DPW and other City agencies to clean up filthy and neglected commercial interests and private property, the City of San Francisco has permitted the Excelsior commercial corridor to become a dangerous, filthy place sorely lacking in services residents want and need.

I am writing to you to make three points:

1. No further MCD's should be approved until John Avalos' proposed anti-clustering legislation is finalized. We have one pot club between Silver and Trumbull, there is no valid reason for opening another one within 1000 feet of that club. We need a mix of businesses - and two pot clubs within 400 feet of each other will stifle further economic development - who will open a coffee shop or deli or pet store or book store near two pot clubs with security guards hanging around outside all day? Who will install a parklet near two pot clubs?

2. The "internet" cafes which are actually gambling halls need to be shut down. The full force of the law must be brought against the property owners and the business owners. These types of businesses can destroy our neighborhood because, again, who in their right mind would open a normal business next door to NetStop or anything like NetStop? Residents are afraid to walk past that store, and it is bringing crime and strife to the Excelsior.

3. The lack of foot patrol officers on Mission Street has been inexcusable for a very long time. On October 9th at 4pm it became crystal clear that people with guns feel perfectly at ease committing murder in broad daylight in front of children in the heart of the Excelsior. This situation cannot be tolerated for one more day.

NSNW has been told multiple times by Ingleside SFPD that due to large numbers of retiring officers that they do not have the manpower to place more than one officer between Mt. Vernon and Silver Avenue, and that when the new officers coming out of the police academy are placed on foot patrol they will be "green" and it will take them a while to learn the ropes. We don't have the luxury of time - please support Captain Falvey and Ingleside SFPD and get them the experienced officers they need to provide my community with sufficient numbers of experienced police officers. We need increased foot patrols between Trumbull Street to Ms. Vernon Street (just past Geneva).

* * *

If the City of San Francisco is going to permit unlimited numbers of MCDs and internet gambling halls to operate in the Excelsior then the City of San Francisco can consider itself the cause of the destruction of this blue collar, hard working, traditional residential district. If the City of San Francisco does not take immediate action to put seasoned police officers on sufficient foot patrols this will send a message that violent crime is permissible on Mission Street in the Excelsior. I urge you to act quickly and in the best interests of the residents and voters of District 11.

I look forward to all opportunities to discuss these matters - whether in town halls meetings, BOS meetings or otherwise.

Patricia De Fonte,
Excelsior Resident and Voter

CC:
Director John Rahaim, The San Francisco Planning Commission John.rahaim@sfgov.org
Supervisor John Avalos john.avalos@sfgov.org
Shahde Tavakoli Shahde Office of Mayor Edwin M. Lee Tavakoli@sfgov.org
Doug Vu, Planning Dept. Staff overseeing the Lucky Dragon MCD planned for 4130 Mission Street, doug_vu@sfgov.org
Mayor Ed Lee, mayoredwinlee@sfgov.org
Captain Timothy Falvey, Ingleside SFPD, timothy.falvey@sfgov.org
San Francisco Board of Supervisors, board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org

[Reply via web post](#) [Reply to sender](#) [Reply to group](#) [Start a New Topic](#) [Messages in this topic \(1\)](#)

RECENT ACTIVITY:
[Visit Your Group](#)

Ney Street Neighborhood Watch

Emcompasses all blocks of Ney Street and adjacent Congdon and Craut

If you see anything suspicious please report it

YAHOO! GROUPS

Switch to: [Text-Only](#) • [Daily Digest](#) • [Unsubscribe](#) • [Terms of Use](#) • [Send us Feedback](#)

file 130084

From: Board of Supervisors
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: 155 new petition signatures

The Office of the Clerk of the Board has received several signed petitions with the same message as the one below. 155 signatures.

Peggy
Office of the Clerk of the Board

From: Christina Bratt-Porter [mailto:mail@changemail.org]
Sent: Tuesday, October 15, 2013 4:51 PM
To: Board of Supervisors
Subject: 5 new petition signatures: Jessica Burden Roinw, Lila Baker...

5 new people recently signed Ney Street Neighborhood Watch's petition "[Tell Mayor Lee and Chief Suhr We Need More Than One Foot Patrol Officer in the Excelsior](#)" on Change.org.

There are now 197 signatures on this petition. Read reasons why people are signing, and respond to Ney Street Neighborhood Watch by clicking here:

<http://www.change.org/petitions/tell-mayor-lee-and-chief-suhr-we-need-more-than-one-foot-patrol-officer-in-the-excelsior/responses/new?response=9272c59f571d>

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

Immediately put additional experienced foot patrol officers on Mission Street from Trumbull to beyond Geneva to Mt. Vernon Street. Currently there is only one officer between Silver Avenue and Geneva – a 1.25 miles patrol area.

Sincerely,

- 151. Jessica Burden Roinw SF, California
- 152. Lila Baker San Francisco, California
- 153. Dorothy Whelan San Francisco, California
- 154. Lily Lieu San Francisco, California
- 155. Christina Bratt-Porter San Francisco, California

From: Deena Lahn [mailto:mail@changemail.org]
Sent: Tuesday, October 15, 2013 7:00 AM
To: Board of Supervisors
Subject: 5 new petition signatures: Sarah Beth Chionsini, Marcia Jarmel...

5 new people recently signed Ney Street Neighborhood Watch's petition "[Tell Mayor Lee and Chief Suhr We Need More Than One Foot Patrol Officer in the Excelsior](#)" on Change.org.

There are now 132 signatures on this petition. Read reasons why people are signing, and respond to Ney Street Neighborhood Watch by clicking here:

<http://www.change.org/petitions/tell-mayor-lee-and-chief-suhr-we-need-more-than-one-foot-patrol-officer-in-the-excelsior/responses/new?response=9272c59f571d>

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

Immediately put additional experienced foot patrol officers on Mission Street from Trumbull to beyond Geneva to Mt. Vernon Street. Currently there is only one officer between Silver Avenue and Geneva – a 1.25 miles patrol area.

Sincerely,

- 126. Sarah Beth Chionsini San Francisco, California
- 127. Marcia Jarmel San Francisco, California
- 128. NAWNEET RANJAN SUNNYVALE, California
- 129. ken schneider San Francisco, California
- 130. Deena Lahn San Francisco, California

From: Gregory Blum [mailto:changemail.org]
Sent: Monday, October 14, 2013 10:40 PM
To: Board of Supervisors
Subject: 5 new petition signatures: Mary Szczepanik , Monica Montoya...

5 new people recently signed Ney Street Neighborhood Watch's petition "[Tell Mayor Lee and Chief Suhr We Need More Than One Foot Patrol Officer in the Excelsior](#)" on Change.org.

There are now 124 signatures on this petition. Read reasons why people are signing, and respond to Ney Street Neighborhood Watch by clicking here:

<http://www.change.org/petitions/tell-mayor-lee-and-chief-suhr-we-need-more-than-one-foot-patrol-officer-in-the-excelsior/responses/new?response=9272c59f571d>

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

Immediately put additional experienced foot patrol officers on Mission Street from Trumbull to beyond Geneva to Mt. Vernon Street. Currently there is only one officer between Silver Avenue and Geneva – a 1.25 miles patrol area.

Sincerely,

121. Mary Szczepanik San Francisco, California
122. Monica Montoya San Francisco, California
123. Imogen Dransfield San Francisco, California
124. tenia worick redondo beach, California
125. Gregory Blum San Francisco, California

From: Josh Neil [mailto:changemail.org]
Sent: Tuesday, October 15, 2013 9:33 AM
To: Board of Supervisors
Subject: 5 new petition signatures: Leara Deane, Andrea Wiener...

5 new people recently signed Ney Street Neighborhood Watch's petition "[Tell Mayor Lee and Chief Suhr We Need More Than One Foot Patrol Officer in the Excelsior](#)" on Change.org.

There are now 148 signatures on this petition. Read reasons why people are signing, and respond to Ney Street Neighborhood Watch by clicking here:

<http://www.change.org/petitions/tell-mayor-lee-and-chief-suhr-we-need-more-than-one-foot-patrol-officer-in-the-excelsior/responses/new?response=9272c59f571d>

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

Immediately put additional experienced foot patrol officers on Mission Street from Trumbull to beyond Geneva to Mt. Vernon Street. Currently there is only one officer between Silver Avenue and Geneva – a 1.25 miles patrol area.

Sincerely,

- 131. Leara Deane San Francisco, California
- 132. Andrea Wiener San Francisco, California
- 133. Jessica Hamman SF, California
- 134. Evra Baldinger San Francisco, California
- 135. Josh Neil Walnut Creek, California

From: Nicole Agbayani [mailto:changemail.org]
Sent: Tuesday, October 15, 2013 11:13 AM
To: Board of Supervisors
Subject: 5 new petition signatures: Vanessa Fontana, Dominic Fontana...

5 new people recently signed Ney Street Neighborhood Watch's petition "[Tell Mayor Lee and Chief Suhr We Need More Than One Foot Patrol Officer in the Excelsior](#)" on Change.org.

There are now 156 signatures on this petition. Read reasons why people are signing, and respond to Ney Street Neighborhood Watch by clicking here:

<http://www.change.org/petitions/tell-mayor-lee-and-chief-suhr-we-need-more-than-one-foot-patrol-officer-in-the-excelsior/responses/new?response=9272c59f571d>

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

Immediately put additional experienced foot patrol officers on Mission Street from Trumbull to beyond Geneva to Mt. Vernon Street. Currently there is only one officer between Silver Avenue and Geneva – a 1.25 miles patrol area.

Sincerely,

- 136. Vanessa Fontana Sacramento, California
- 137. Dominic Fontana San Francisco, California
- 138. Annie Jupiter-Jones San Francisco, California
- 139. N Soriano San Francisco, California
- 140. Nicole Agbayani San Francisco, California

From: Allan Apellanes [mailto:changemail.org]
Sent: Tuesday, October 15, 2013 1:03 PM
To: Board of Supervisors
Subject: 5 new petition signatures: Robin Beers, Julie Kanter...

5 new people recently signed Ney Street Neighborhood Watch's petition "[Tell Mayor Lee and Chief Suhr We Need More Than One Foot Patrol Officer in the Excelsior](#)" on Change.org.

There are now 167 signatures on this petition. Read reasons why people are signing, and respond to Ney Street Neighborhood Watch by clicking here:

<http://www.change.org/petitions/tell-mayor-lee-and-chief-suhr-we-need-more-than-one-foot-patrol-officer-in-the-excelsior/responses/new?response=9272c59f571d>

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

Immediately put additional experienced foot patrol officers on Mission Street from Trumbull to beyond Geneva to Mt. Vernon Street. Currently there is only one officer between Silver Avenue and Geneva – a 1.25 miles patrol area.

Sincerely,

141. Robin Beers San Francisco, California
142. Julie Kanter San Francisco, California
143. Janice Alexander San Francisco, California
144. Gloria Hutter San Francisco, California
145. Allan Apellanes San Francisco, California

From: Lisa Duba [mailto:changemail.org]
Sent: Tuesday, October 15, 2013 1:52 PM
To: Board of Supervisors
Subject: 5 new petition signatures: Tara Duggan, wendy turner...

5 new people recently signed Ney Street Neighborhood Watch's petition "[Tell Mayor Lee and Chief Suhr We Need More Than One Foot Patrol Officer in the Excelsior](#)" on Change.org.

There are now 172 signatures on this petition. Read reasons why people are signing, and respond to Ney Street Neighborhood Watch by clicking here:

<http://www.change.org/petitions/tell-mayor-lee-and-chief-suhr-we-need-more-than-one-foot-patrol-officer-in-the-excelsior/responses/new?response=9272c59f571d>

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

Immediately put additional experienced foot patrol officers on Mission Street from Trumbull to beyond Geneva to Mt. Vernon Street. Currently there is only one officer between Silver Avenue and Geneva – a 1.25 miles patrol area.

Sincerely,

- 146. Tara Duggan San Francisco , California
- 147. wendy turner San Francisco, California
- 148. Liz Farsaci San Francisco, California
- 149. Danielle Delorio Daly City, California
- 150. Lisa Duba San Francisco, California

From: kae sharpe [mailto:changemail.org]
Sent: Monday, October 14, 2013 9:03 PM
To: Board of Supervisors
Subject: 5 new petition signatures: angie black, Pollyana Goncalves...

5 new people recently signed Ney Street Neighborhood Watch's petition "[Tell Mayor Lee and Chief Suhr We Need More Than One Foot Patrol Officer in the Excelsior](#)" on Change.org.

There are now 115 signatures on this petition. Read reasons why people are signing, and respond to Ney Street Neighborhood Watch by clicking here:

<http://www.change.org/petitions/tell-mayor-lee-and-chief-suhr-we-need-more-than-one-foot-patrol-officer-in-the-excelsior/responses/new?response=9272c59f571d>

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

Immediately put additional experienced foot patrol officers on Mission Street from Trumbull to beyond Geneva to Mt. Vernon Street. Currently there is only one officer between Silver Avenue and Geneva – a 1.25 miles patrol area.

Sincerely,

111. angie black San Jose, California
112. Pollyana Goncalves Daly City, California
113. Melissa Wang San Francisco, California
114. Carina Baird San Francisco, California
115. kae sharpe Alameda, California

From: Albert Ho [mailto:changemail.org]
Sent: Monday, October 14, 2013 5:52 PM
To: Board of Supervisors
Subject: 5 new petition signatures: Claudia Decost, Anjali Pioso...

5 new people recently signed Ney Street Neighborhood Watch's petition "[Tell Mayor Lee and Chief Suhr We Need More Than One Foot Patrol Officer in the Excelsior](#)" on Change.org.

There are now 105 signatures on this petition. Read reasons why people are signing, and respond to Ney Street Neighborhood Watch by clicking here:

<http://www.change.org/petitions/tell-mayor-lee-and-chief-suhr-we-need-more-than-one-foot-patrol-officer-in-the-excelsior/responses/new?response=9272c59f571d>

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

Immediately put additional experienced foot patrol officers on Mission Street from Trumbull to beyond Geneva to Mt. Vernon Street. Currently there is only one officer between Silver Avenue and Geneva – a 1.25 miles patrol area.

Sincerely,

101. Claudia Decost San Francisco, California
102. Anjali Pioso San Francisco, California
103. LeAnn Raschke San Francisco, California
104. Karyn Desai San Francisco, California
105. Albert Ho San Francisco, California

From: Matt Householder [mailto:changemail.org]
Sent: Monday, October 14, 2013 4:49 PM
To: Board of Supervisors
Subject: 5 new petition signatures: analise torrez, CJ Russell...

5 new people recently signed Ney Street Neighborhood Watch's petition "[Tell Mayor Lee and Chief Suhr We Need More Than One Foot Patrol Officer in the Excelsior](#)" on Change.org.

There are now 99 signatures on this petition. Read reasons why people are signing, and respond to Ney Street Neighborhood Watch by clicking here:

<http://www.change.org/petitions/tell-mayor-lee-and-chief-suhr-we-need-more-than-one-foot-patrol-officer-in-the-excelsior/responses/new?response=9272c59f571d>

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

Immediately put additional experienced foot patrol officers on Mission Street from Trumbull to beyond Geneva to Mt. Vernon Street. Currently there is only one officer between Silver Avenue and Geneva – a 1.25 miles patrol area.

Sincerely,

- 96. analise torrez San Francisco, California
- 97. CJ Russell San Francisco, California
- 98. Anne Marie Betancourt San Francisco, California
- 99. Becky Perrine San Francisco, California
- 100. Matt Householder San Francisco, California

From: Diane Bekkers [mailto:changemail.org]
Sent: Monday, October 14, 2013 3:52 PM
To: Board of Supervisors
Subject: 5 new petition signatures: Sara Scanlan, Michael Sevy...

5 new people recently signed Ney Street Neighborhood Watch's petition "[Tell Mayor Lee and Chief Suhr We Need More Than One Foot Patrol Officer in the Excelsior](#)" on Change.org.

There are now 95 signatures on this petition. Read reasons why people are signing, and respond to Ney Street Neighborhood Watch by clicking here:

<http://www.change.org/petitions/tell-mayor-lee-and-chief-suhr-we-need-more-than-one-foot-patrol-officer-in-the-excelsior/responses/new?response=9272c59f571d>

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

Immediately put additional experienced foot patrol officers on Mission Street from Trumbull to beyond Geneva to Mt. Vernon Street. Currently there is only one officer between Silver Avenue and Geneva – a 1.25 miles patrol area.

Sincerely,

91. Sara Scanlan San Francisco, California
92. Michael Sevy San Francisco, California
93. Paloma Murphy San Francisco, California
94. Alejandro Ledesma San Francisco, California
95. Diane Bekkers San Francisco, California

From: olivia coontreras [mailto:changemail.org]
Sent: Monday, October 14, 2013 2:44 PM
To: Board of Supervisors
Subject: 5 new petition signatures: Mary Murphy, Gaby Marin...

5 new people recently signed Ney Street Neighborhood Watch's petition "[Tell Mayor Lee and Chief Suhr We Need More Than One Foot Patrol Officer in the Excelsior](#)" on Change.org.

There are now 85 signatures on this petition. Read reasons why people are signing, and respond to Ney Street Neighborhood Watch by clicking here:

<http://www.change.org/petitions/tell-mayor-lee-and-chief-suhr-we-need-more-than-one-foot-patrol-officer-in-the-excelsior/responses/new?response=9272c59f571d>

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

Immediately put additional experienced foot patrol officers on Mission Street from Trumbull to beyond Geneva to Mt. Vernon Street. Currently there is only one officer between Silver Avenue and Geneva – a 1.25 miles patrol area.

Sincerely,

81. Mary Murphy Rockport, Texas
82. Gaby Marin San Francisco, California
83. Jackie Leslie San Francisco, California
84. Nicole Lee San Francisco, California
85. olivia coontreras san francisco, California

From: Kimberly Donner [mailto:changemail.org]
Sent: Monday, October 14, 2013 2:21 PM
To: Board of Supervisors
Subject: 5 new petition signatures: John Kealy, Shannon Selby...

5 new people recently signed Ney Street Neighborhood Watch's petition "[Tell Mayor Lee and Chief Suhr We Need More Than One Foot Patrol Officer in the Excelsior](#)" on Change.org.

There are now 79 signatures on this petition. Read reasons why people are signing, and respond to Ney Street Neighborhood Watch by clicking here:

<http://www.change.org/petitions/tell-mayor-lee-and-chief-suhr-we-need-more-than-one-foot-patrol-officer-in-the-excelsior/responses/new?response=9272c59f571d>

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

Immediately put additional experienced foot patrol officers on Mission Street from Trumbull to beyond Geneva to Mt. Vernon Street. Currently there is only one officer between Silver Avenue and Geneva – a 1.25 miles patrol area.

Sincerely,

- 76. John Kealy San Francisco, California
- 77. Shannon Selby San Francisco, California
- 78. amy graff san francisco, California
- 79. Chad Gaver San Francisco, California
- 80. Kimberly Donner San Francisco, California

From: minaksi dave [mailto:changemail.org]
Sent: Monday, October 14, 2013 2:15 PM
To: Board of Supervisors
Subject: 5 new petition signatures: Maggie Tanner, Margaret Lanphier...

5 new people recently signed Ney Street Neighborhood Watch's petition "[Tell Mayor Lee and Chief Suhr We Need More Than One Foot Patrol Officer in the Excelsior](#)" on Change.org.

There are now 75 signatures on this petition. Read reasons why people are signing, and respond to Ney Street Neighborhood Watch by clicking here:

<http://www.change.org/petitions/tell-mayor-lee-and-chief-suhr-we-need-more-than-one-foot-patrol-officer-in-the-excelsior/responses/new?response=9272c59f571d>

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

Immediately put additional experienced foot patrol officers on Mission Street from Trumbull to beyond Geneva to Mt. Vernon Street. Currently there is only one officer between Silver Avenue and Geneva – a 1.25 miles patrol area.

Sincerely,

- 71. Maggie Tanner Grand Terrace, California
- 72. Margaret Lanphier San Francisco, California
- 73. Michelle Trott San Francisco, California
- 74. Jessa Reus San Francisco, California
- 75. minaksi dave san francisco, California

From: Renee Anderson [mailto:changemail.org]
Sent: Monday, October 14, 2013 1:17 PM
To: Board of Supervisors
Subject: 5 new petition signatures: Andrea Ferrucci, Charles Kaupp...

5 new people recently signed Ney Street Neighborhood Watch's petition "[Tell Mayor Lee and Chief Suhr We Need More Than One Foot Patrol Officer in the Excelsior](#)" on Change.org.

There are now 69 signatures on this petition. Read reasons why people are signing, and respond to Ney Street Neighborhood Watch by clicking here:

<http://www.change.org/petitions/tell-mayor-lee-and-chief-suhr-we-need-more-than-one-foot-patrol-officer-in-the-excelsior/responses/new?response=9272c59f571d>

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

Immediately put additional experienced foot patrol officers on Mission Street from Trumbull to beyond Geneva to Mt. Vernon Street. Currently there is only one officer between Silver Avenue and Geneva – a 1.25 miles patrol area.

Sincerely,

- 66. Andrea Ferrucci San Francisco, California
- 67. Charles Kaupp San Francisco, California
- 68. Eliza Gibson San Francisco, California
- 69. Kimberly Sae-Ung San Francisco, California
- 70. Renee Anderson San Francisco, California

From: Allyson Ritger [mailto:changemail.org]
Sent: Monday, October 14, 2013 12:08 PM
To: Board of Supervisors
Subject: 5 new petition signatures: Sara Solano, Mark Picciano...

5 new people recently signed Ney Street Neighborhood Watch's petition "[Tell Mayor Lee and Chief Suhr We Need More Than One Foot Patrol Officer in the Excelsior](#)" on Change.org.

There are now 65 signatures on this petition. Read reasons why people are signing, and respond to Ney Street Neighborhood Watch by clicking here:

<http://www.change.org/petitions/tell-mayor-lee-and-chief-suhr-we-need-more-than-one-foot-patrol-officer-in-the-excelsior/responses/new?response=9272c59f571d>

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

Immediately put additional experienced foot patrol officers on Mission Street from Trumbull to beyond Geneva to Mt. Vernon Street. Currently there is only one officer between Silver Avenue and Geneva – a 1.25 miles patrol area.

Sincerely,

61. Sara Solano San Francisco, California
62. Mark Picciano San Francisco, California
63. Rosina Rucci Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
64. Katherine Sherwood San Francisco, California
65. Allyson Ritger San Francisco, California

From: john alden [mailto:changemail.org]
Sent: Monday, October 14, 2013 10:39 AM
To: Board of Supervisors
Subject: 5 new petition signatures: donato defonte, Frank La...

5 new people recently signed Ney Street Neighborhood Watch's petition "[Tell Mayor Lee and Chief Suhr We Need More Than One Foot Patrol Officer in the Excelsior](#)" on Change.org.

There are now 60 signatures on this petition. Read reasons why people are signing, and respond to Ney Street Neighborhood Watch by clicking here:

<http://www.change.org/petitions/tell-mayor-lee-and-chief-suhr-we-need-more-than-one-foot-patrol-officer-in-the-excelsior/responses/new?response=9272c59f571d>

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

Immediately put additional experienced foot patrol officers on Mission Street from Trumbull to beyond Geneva to Mt. Vernon Street. Currently there is only one officer between Silver Avenue and Geneva – a 1.25 miles patrol area.

Sincerely,

- 57. donato defonte 2948 carradale dr roseville, California
- 57. Frank La San Francisco, California
- 58. Brigitte Davila San Francisco, California
- 59. Chris Benson San Francisco, California
- 60. john alden San Francisco, California

From: Connie Leung [mailto:changemail.org]
Sent: Monday, October 14, 2013 8:34 AM
To: Board of Supervisors
Subject: 5 new petition signatures: Monique Mead, Erin Cervelli...

5 new people recently signed Ney Street Neighborhood Watch's petition "[Tell Mayor Lee and Chief Suhr We Need More Than One Foot Patrol Officer in the Excelsior](#)" on Change.org.

There are now 55 signatures on this petition. Read reasons why people are signing, and respond to Ney Street Neighborhood Watch by clicking here:

<http://www.change.org/petitions/tell-mayor-lee-and-chief-suhr-we-need-more-than-one-foot-patrol-officer-in-the-excelsior/responses/new?response=9272c59f571d>

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

Immediately put additional experienced foot patrol officers on Mission Street from Trumbull to beyond Geneva to Mt. Vernon Street. Currently there is only one officer between Silver Avenue and Geneva – a 1.25 miles patrol area.

Sincerely,

51. Monique Mead San Francisco, California
52. Erin Cervelli San Francisco, California
53. s owens San Francisco, California
54. Tom Kirvin San Francisco, California
55. Connie Leung San Francisco, California

From: Hilary Davis [mailto:changemail.org]
Sent: Monday, October 14, 2013 6:52 AM
To: Board of Supervisors
Subject: I just signed "San Francisco Police Chief Greg Suhr, Mayor Ed Lee and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors: Immediately put additional experienced foot patrol officers on Mission Street from Trumbull to Geneva. Currently there is only one officer bet..."

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I just signed Ney Street Neighborhood Watch's petition "[San Francisco Police Chief Greg Suhr, Mayor Ed Lee and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors: Immediately put additional experienced foot patrol officers on Mission Street from Trumbull to Geneva. Currently there is only one officer between Silver & Gene](#)" on Change.org.

Immediately put additional experienced foot patrol officers on Mission Street from Trumbull to beyond Geneva to Mt. Vernon Street. Currently there is only one officer between Silver Avenue and Geneva – a 1.25 miles patrol area.

Sincerely,
Hilary Davis San Francisco, California

There are now 50 signatures on this petition. Read reasons why people are signing, and respond to Ney Street Neighborhood Watch by clicking here:
<http://www.change.org/petitions/san-francisco-police-chief-greg-suhr-mayor-ed-lee-and-the-san-francisco-board-of-supervisors-immediately-put-additional-experienced-foot-patrol-officers-on-mission-street-from-trumbull-to-geneva-currently-there-is-only-one-officer-between-silver-gene/responses/new?response=9272c59f571d>

From: Cheryl Kalson [mailto:changemail.org]
Sent: Monday, October 14, 2013 6:43 AM
To: Board of Supervisors
Subject: I just signed "San Francisco Police Chief Greg Suhr, Mayor Ed Lee and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors: Immediately put additional experienced foot patrol officers on Mission Street from Trumbull to Geneva. Currently there is only one officer bet..."

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I just signed Ney Street Neighborhood Watch's petition "San Francisco Police Chief Greg Suhr, Mayor Ed Lee and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors: Immediately put additional experienced foot patrol officers on Mission Street from Trumbull to Geneva. Currently there is only one officer between Silver & Gene" on Change.org.

Immediately put additional experienced foot patrol officers on Mission Street from Trumbull to beyond Geneva to Mt. Vernon Street. Currently there is only one officer between Silver Avenue and Geneva – a 1.25 miles patrol area.

Sincerely,
Cheryl Kalson San Francisco, California

There are now 49 signatures on this petition. Read reasons why people are signing, and respond to Ney Street Neighborhood Watch by clicking here:

<http://www.change.org/petitions/san-francisco-police-chief-greg-suhr-mayor-ed-lee-and-the-san-francisco-board-of-supervisors-immediately-put-additional-experienced-foot-patrol-officers-on-mission-street-from-trumbull-to-geneva-currently-there-is-only-one-officer-between-silver-gene/responses/new?response=9272c59f571d>

From: Ralph Garcia [mailto:changemail.org]
Sent: Sunday, October 13, 2013 10:14 PM
To: Board of Supervisors
Subject: I just signed "San Francisco Police Chief Greg Suhr, Mayor Ed Lee and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors: Immediately put additional experienced foot patrol officers on Mission Street from Trumbull to Geneva. Currently there is only one officer bet..."

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I just signed Ney Street Neighborhood Watch's petition "[San Francisco Police Chief Greg Suhr, Mayor Ed Lee and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors: Immediately put additional experienced foot patrol officers on Mission Street from Trumbull to Geneva. Currently there is only one officer between Silver & Gene](#)" on Change.org.

Immediately put additional experienced foot patrol officers on Mission Street from Trumbull to beyond Geneva to Mt. Vernon Street. Currently there is only one officer between Silver Avenue and Geneva – a 1.25 miles patrol area.

Sincerely,
Ralph Garcia Rawlins, Wyoming

There are now 48 signatures on this petition. Read reasons why people are signing, and respond to Ney Street Neighborhood Watch by clicking here:

<http://www.change.org/petitions/san-francisco-police-chief-greg-suhr-mayor-ed-lee-and-the-san-francisco-board-of-supervisors-immediately-put-additional-experienced-foot-patrol-officers-on-mission-street-from-trumbull-to-geneva-currently-there-is-only-one-officer-between-silver-gene/responses/new?response=9272c59f571d>

From: carlin decato [mailto:changemail.org]
Sent: Sunday, October 13, 2013 10:08 PM
To: Board of Supervisors
Subject: I just signed "San Francisco Police Chief Greg Suhr, Mayor Ed Lee and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors: Immediately put additional experienced foot patrol officers on Mission Street from Trumbull to Geneva. Currently there is only one officer bet..."

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I just signed Ney Street Neighborhood Watch's petition "San Francisco Police Chief Greg Suhr, Mayor Ed Lee and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors: Immediately put additional experienced foot patrol officers on Mission Street from Trumbull to Geneva. Currently there is only one officer between Silver & Gene" on Change.org.

Immediately put additional experienced foot patrol officers on Mission Street from Trumbull to beyond Geneva to Mt. Vernon Street. Currently there is only one officer between Silver Avenue and Geneva – a 1.25 miles patrol area.

Sincerely,
carlin decato San Francisco, California

There are now 46 signatures on this petition. Read reasons why people are signing, and respond to Ney Street Neighborhood Watch by clicking here:
<http://www.change.org/petitions/san-francisco-police-chief-greg-suhr-mayor-ed-lee-and-the-san-francisco-board-of-supervisors-immediately-put-additional-experienced-foot-patrol-officers-on-mission-street-from-trumbull-to-geneva-currently-there-is-only-one-officer-between-silver-gene/responses/new?response=9272c59f571d>

From: Leah A [mailto:changemail.org]
Sent: Sunday, October 13, 2013 9:36 PM
To: Board of Supervisors
Subject: I just signed "San Francisco Police Chief Greg Suhr, Mayor Ed Lee and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors: Immediately put additional experienced foot patrol officers on Mission Street from Trumbull to Geneva. Currently there is only one officer bet..."

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I just signed Ney Street Neighborhood Watch's petition "[San Francisco Police Chief Greg Suhr, Mayor Ed Lee and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors: Immediately put additional experienced foot patrol officers on Mission Street from Trumbull to Geneva. Currently there is only one officer between Silver & Gene](#)" on Change.org.

Immediately put additional experienced foot patrol officers on Mission Street from Trumbull to beyond Geneva to Mt. Vernon Street. Currently there is only one officer between Silver Avenue and Geneva – a 1.25 miles patrol area.

Sincerely,
Leah A San Francisco, California

There are now 45 signatures on this petition. Read reasons why people are signing, and respond to Ney Street Neighborhood Watch by clicking here:
<http://www.change.org/petitions/san-francisco-police-chief-greg-suhr-mayor-ed-lee-and-the-san-francisco-board-of-supervisors-immediately-put-additional-experienced-foot-patrol-officers-on-mission-street-from-trumbull-to-geneva-currently-there-is-only-one-officer-between-silver-gene/responses/new?response=9272c59f571d>

From: Amie Latterman [mailto:changemail.org]
Sent: Sunday, October 13, 2013 9:25 PM
To: Board of Supervisors
Subject: I just signed "San Francisco Police Chief Greg Suhr, Mayor Ed Lee and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors: Immediately put additional experienced foot patrol officers on Mission Street from Trumbull to Geneva. Currently there is only one officer bet..."

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I just signed Ney Street Neighborhood Watch's petition "San Francisco Police Chief Greg Suhr, Mayor Ed Lee and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors: Immediately put additional experienced foot patrol officers on Mission Street from Trumbull to Geneva. Currently there is only one officer between Silver & Gene" on Change.org.

Immediately put additional experienced foot patrol officers on Mission Street from Trumbull to beyond Geneva to Mt. Vernon Street. Currently there is only one officer between Silver Avenue and Geneva – a 1.25 miles patrol area.

Sincerely,
Amie Latterman San Francisco, California

There are now 44 signatures on this petition. Read reasons why people are signing, and respond to Ney Street Neighborhood Watch by clicking here:

<http://www.change.org/petitions/san-francisco-police-chief-greg-suhr-mayor-ed-lee-and-the-san-francisco-board-of-supervisors-immediately-put-additional-experienced-foot-patrol-officers-on-mission-street-from-trumbull-to-geneva-currently-there-is-only-one-officer-between-silver-gene/responses/new?response=9272c59f571d>

From: Katrina Broomall [mailto:mail@changemail.org]
Sent: Sunday, October 13, 2013 9:19 PM
To: Board of Supervisors
Subject: I just signed "San Francisco Police Chief Greg Suhr, Mayor Ed Lee and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors: Immediately put additional experienced foot patrol officers on Mission Street from Trumbull to Geneva. Currently there is only one officer bet..."

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I just signed Ney Street Neighborhood Watch's petition "[San Francisco Police Chief Greg Suhr, Mayor Ed Lee and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors: Immediately put additional experienced foot patrol officers on Mission Street from Trumbull to Geneva. Currently there is only one officer between Silver & Gene](#)" on Change.org.

Immediately put additional experienced foot patrol officers on Mission Street from Trumbull to beyond Geneva to Mt. Vernon Street. Currently there is only one officer between Silver Avenue and Geneva – a 1.25 miles patrol area.

Sincerely,
Katrina Broomall San Francisco, California

There are now 43 signatures on this petition. Read reasons why people are signing, and respond to Ney Street Neighborhood Watch by clicking here:
<http://www.change.org/petitions/san-francisco-police-chief-greg-suhr-mayor-ed-lee-and-the-san-francisco-board-of-supervisors-immediately-put-additional-experienced-foot-patrol-officers-on-mission-street-from-trumbull-to-geneva-currently-there-is-only-one-officer-between-silver-gene/responses/new?response=9272c59f571d>

From: Gail Finne [mailto:changemail.org]
Sent: Sunday, October 13, 2013 9:13 PM
To: Board of Supervisors
Subject: I just signed "San Francisco Police Chief Greg Suhr, Mayor Ed Lee and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors: Immediately put additional experienced foot patrol officers on Mission Street from Trumbull to Geneva. Currently there is only one officer bet..."

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I just signed Ney Street Neighborhood Watch's petition "San Francisco Police Chief Greg Suhr, Mayor Ed Lee and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors: Immediately put additional experienced foot patrol officers on Mission Street from Trumbull to Geneva. Currently there is only one officer between Silver & Gene" on Change.org.

Immediately put additional experienced foot patrol officers on Mission Street from Trumbull to beyond Geneva to Mt. Vernon Street. Currently there is only one officer between Silver Avenue and Geneva – a 1.25 miles patrol area.

Sincerely,
Gail Finne San Francisco, California

There are now 42 signatures on this petition. Read reasons why people are signing, and respond to Ney Street Neighborhood Watch by clicking here:

<http://www.change.org/petitions/san-francisco-police-chief-greg-suhr-mayor-ed-lee-and-the-san-francisco-board-of-supervisors-immediately-put-additional-experienced-foot-patrol-officers-on-mission-street-from-trumbull-to-geneva-currently-there-is-only-one-officer-between-silver-gene/responses/new?response=9272c59f571d>

From: Tim OConnor [mailto:changemail.org]
Sent: Sunday, October 13, 2013 8:01 PM
To: Board of Supervisors
Subject: I just signed "San Francisco Police Chief Greg Suhr, Mayor Ed Lee and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors: Immediately put additional experienced foot patrol officers on Mission Street from Trumbull to Geneva. Currently there is only one officer bet..."

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I just signed Ney Street Neighborhood Watch's petition "San Francisco Police Chief Greg Suhr, Mayor Ed Lee and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors: Immediately put additional experienced foot patrol officers on Mission Street from Trumbull to Geneva. Currently there is only one officer between Silver & Gene" on Change.org.

Immediately put additional experienced foot patrol officers on Mission Street from Trumbull to beyond Geneva to Mt. Vernon Street. Currently there is only one officer between Silver Avenue and Geneva – a 1.25 miles patrol area.

Sincerely,
Tim OConnor San Francisco, California

There are now 40 signatures on this petition. Read reasons why people are signing, and respond to Ney Street Neighborhood Watch by clicking here:

<http://www.change.org/petitions/san-francisco-police-chief-greg-suhr-mayor-ed-lee-and-the-san-francisco-board-of-supervisors-immediately-put-additional-experienced-foot-patrol-officers-on-mission-street-from-trumbull-to-geneva-currently-there-is-only-one-officer-between-silver-gene/responses/new?response=9272c59f571d>

From: Deborah Boero [mailto:changemail.org]
Sent: Sunday, October 13, 2013 7:23 PM
To: Board of Supervisors
Subject: I just signed "San Francisco Police Chief Greg Suhr, Mayor Ed Lee and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors: Immediately put additional experienced foot patrol officers on Mission Street from Trumbull to Geneva. Currently there is only one officer bet..."

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I just signed Ney Street Neighborhood Watch's petition "San Francisco Police Chief Greg Suhr, Mayor Ed Lee and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors: Immediately put additional experienced foot patrol officers on Mission Street from Trumbull to Geneva. Currently there is only one officer between Silver & Gene" on Change.org.

Immediately put additional experienced foot patrol officers on Mission Street from Trumbull to beyond Geneva to Mt. Vernon Street. Currently there is only one officer between Silver Avenue and Geneva – a 1.25 miles patrol area.

Sincerely,
Deborah Boero San Francisco, California

There are now 39 signatures on this petition. Read reasons why people are signing, and respond to Ney Street Neighborhood Watch by clicking here:

<http://www.change.org/petitions/san-francisco-police-chief-greg-suhr-mayor-ed-lee-and-the-san-francisco-board-of-supervisors-immediately-put-additional-experienced-foot-patrol-officers-on-mission-street-from-trumbull-to-geneva-currently-there-is-only-one-officer-between-silver-gene/responses/new?response=9272c59f571d>

From: Michael Sova [mailto:changemail.org]
Sent: Sunday, October 13, 2013 6:53 PM
To: Board of Supervisors
Subject: I just signed "San Francisco Police Chief Greg Suhr, Mayor Ed Lee and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors: Immediately put additional experienced foot patrol officers on Mission Street from Trumbull to Geneva. Currently there is only one officer bet.."

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I just signed Ney Street Neighborhood Watch's petition "San Francisco Police Chief Greg Suhr, Mayor Ed Lee and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors: Immediately put additional experienced foot patrol officers on Mission Street from Trumbull to Geneva. Currently there is only one officer between Silver & Gene" on Change.org.

Immediately put additional experienced foot patrol officers on Mission Street from Trumbull to beyond Geneva to Mt. Vernon Street. Currently there is only one officer between Silver Avenue and Geneva – a 1.25 miles patrol area.

Sincerely,
Michael Sova San Francisco, California

There are now 38 signatures on this petition. Read reasons why people are signing, and respond to Ney Street Neighborhood Watch by clicking here:

<http://www.change.org/petitions/san-francisco-police-chief-greg-suhr-mayor-ed-lee-and-the-san-francisco-board-of-supervisors-immediately-put-additional-experienced-foot-patrol-officers-on-mission-street-from-trumbull-to-geneva-currently-there-is-only-one-officer-between-silver-gene/responses/new?response=9272c59f571d>

From: Robert Greco [mailto:changemail.org]
Sent: Sunday, October 13, 2013 6:11 PM
To: Board of Supervisors
Subject: I just signed "San Francisco Police Chief Greg Suhr, Mayor Ed Lee and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors: Immediately put additional experienced foot patrol officers on Mission Street from Trumbull to Geneva. Currently there is only one officer bet..."

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I just signed Ney Street Neighborhood Watch's petition "San Francisco Police Chief Greg Suhr, Mayor Ed Lee and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors: Immediately put additional experienced foot patrol officers on Mission Street from Trumbull to Geneva. Currently there is only one officer between Silver & Gene" on Change.org.

Immediately put additional experienced foot patrol officers on Mission Street from Trumbull to beyond Geneva to Mt. Vernon Street. Currently there is only one officer between Silver Avenue and Geneva – a 1.25 miles patrol area.

Sincerely,
Robert Greco San Francisco, California

There are now 37 signatures on this petition. Read reasons why people are signing, and respond to Ney Street Neighborhood Watch by clicking here:

<http://www.change.org/petitions/san-francisco-police-chief-greg-suhr-mayor-ed-lee-and-the-san-francisco-board-of-supervisors-immediately-put-additional-experienced-foot-patrol-officers-on-mission-street-from-trumbull-to-geneva-currently-there-is-only-one-officer-between-silver-gene/responses/new?response=9272c59f571d>

From: Chris Mielke [mailto:changemail.org]
Sent: Sunday, October 13, 2013 5:49 PM
To: Board of Supervisors
Subject: I just signed "San Francisco Police Chief Greg Suhr, Mayor Ed Lee and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors: Immediately put additional experienced foot patrol officers on Mission Street from Trumbull to Geneva. Currently there is only one officer bet..."

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I just signed Ney Street Neighborhood Watch's petition "San Francisco Police Chief Greg Suhr, Mayor Ed Lee and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors: Immediately put additional experienced foot patrol officers on Mission Street from Trumbull to Geneva. Currently there is only one officer between Silver & Gene" on Change.org.

Immediately put additional experienced foot patrol officers on Mission Street from Trumbull to beyond Geneva to Mt. Vernon Street. Currently there is only one officer between Silver Avenue and Geneva – a 1.25 miles patrol area.

Sincerely,
Chris Mielke San Francisco, California

There are now 36 signatures on this petition. Read reasons why people are signing, and respond to Ney Street Neighborhood Watch by clicking here:

<http://www.change.org/petitions/san-francisco-police-chief-greg-suhr-mayor-ed-lee-and-the-san-francisco-board-of-supervisors-immediately-put-additional-experienced-foot-patrol-officers-on-mission-street-from-trumbull-to-geneva-currently-there-is-only-one-officer-between-silver-gene/responses/new?response=9272c59f571d>

From: Barbara Fugate [mailto:changemail.org]
Sent: Sunday, October 13, 2013 5:26 PM
To: Board of Supervisors
Subject: I just signed "San Francisco Police Chief Greg Suhr, Mayor Ed Lee and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors: Immediately put additional experienced foot patrol officers on Mission Street from Trumbull to Geneva. Currently there is only one officer bet..."

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I just signed Ney Street Neighborhood Watch's petition "San Francisco Police Chief Greg Suhr, Mayor Ed Lee and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors: Immediately put additional experienced foot patrol officers on Mission Street from Trumbull to Geneva. Currently there is only one officer between Silver & Gene" on Change.org.

Immediately put additional experienced foot patrol officers on Mission Street from Trumbull to beyond Geneva to Mt. Vernon Street. Currently there is only one officer between Silver Avenue and Geneva – a 1.25 miles patrol area.

Sincerely,
Barbara Fugate San Francisco, California

There are now 35 signatures on this petition. Read reasons why people are signing, and respond to Ney Street Neighborhood Watch by clicking here:
<http://www.change.org/petitions/san-francisco-police-chief-greg-suhr-mayor-ed-lee-and-the-san-francisco-board-of-supervisors-immediately-put-additional-experienced-foot-patrol-officers-on-mission-street-from-trumbull-to-geneva-currently-there-is-only-one-officer-between-silver-gene/responses/new?response=9272c59f571d>

From: Mark Jordan [mailto:changemail.org]
Sent: Sunday, October 13, 2013 5:15 PM
To: Board of Supervisors
Subject: I just signed "San Francisco Police Chief Greg Suhr, Mayor Ed Lee and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors: Immediately put additional experienced foot patrol officers on Mission Street from Trumbull to Geneva. Currently there is only one officer bet..."

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I just signed Ney Street Neighborhood Watch's petition "[San Francisco Police Chief Greg Suhr, Mayor Ed Lee and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors: Immediately put additional experienced foot patrol officers on Mission Street from Trumbull to Geneva. Currently there is only one officer between Silver & Gene](#)" on Change.org.

Immediately put additional experienced foot patrol officers on Mission Street from Trumbull to beyond Geneva to Mt. Vernon Street. Currently there is only one officer between Silver Avenue and Geneva – a 1.25 miles patrol area.

Sincerely,
Mark Jordan San Francisco, California

There are now 34 signatures on this petition. Read reasons why people are signing, and respond to Ney Street Neighborhood Watch by clicking here:

<http://www.change.org/petitions/san-francisco-police-chief-greg-suhr-mayor-ed-lee-and-the-san-francisco-board-of-supervisors-immediately-put-additional-experienced-foot-patrol-officers-on-mission-street-from-trumbull-to-geneva-currently-there-is-only-one-officer-between-silver-gene/responses/new?response=9272c59f571d>

Miller, Alisa

From: Chuck Whelon [whelon@mac.com]
Sent: Friday, October 11, 2013 4:20 PM
To: Board of Supervisors; Miller, Alisa
Cc: Avalos, John; Hsieh, Frances; Pollock, Jeremy
Subject: Outer Mission Street Neighborhood Commercial District

Dear Supervisors & Clerk for the Land use Committee,

As a home-owner and parent living in San Francisco's Excelsior district, I am writing this formal letter of support for limiting alcohol sales and fringe financial businesses, as well as preventing any additional Medical Cannabis Dispensaries anywhere along Geneva, or the Excelsior's Mission Street section

In particular, I support the legislation introduced by Supervisor Avalos earlier this year, to create an Outer Mission Street Neighborhood Commercial District (NCD), covering the Mission Street corridor from Trumbull to the San Francisco-San Mateo County border, and including business along Geneva.

I have lived in the Excelsior for over a decade now, and during that time I have found the neighborhood to be a pleasant, friendly and open place to live, and I have seen a gradual but steady improvement in the condition of properties and the businesses supported by the Mission Street Corridor (e.g. Library renovation, playgrounds, shops, restaurants, Balboa Park, McLaren Park). However, over the last year or so this trend seems to have reversed. I don't know if the cause is the general economy or something else, but businesses such as the online gambling casino "Net Stop" at 4458 Mission St (between Cotter St & Francis St) seem to be a contributing factor.

The opening of "Net Stop" has caused a marked increase in the number of people hanging out on the street in that area, and has generally caused a rise in the number of crimes reported in the vicinity of that business. This increase in crime seems to have been brought to a head in the tragic fatal shooting at the corner of Mission and Brazil this past Wednesday. Need I add that the incident occurred right outside the check-cashing business on that corner?

In my own personal experience, just a couple of weeks ago, I was walking home up Persia Street toward my home on Paris Street when I was punched in the head for no apparent reason by a rough-looking man that I did not know. The blow knocked me to the ground and left me with a mild concussion, but fortunately/strangely I was not actually robbed. As someone who suffers from Spina Bifida and has difficulty walking, I found the whole incident to be particularly distressing. Never before have I experienced anything remotely like this in this neighborhood. (SFPD Case # 130 738 884)

"Net Stop" itself is only 2 very short blocks from the San Francisco Community School (Elementary & Middle) and another block away is Monroe Elementary School. My son is in 6th Grade at SFCS right now, and I no longer feel safe in allowing him to walk alone to his school which is only a block and a half from our house, across Brazil Street.

I realize that some more central areas of Mission Street have become increasingly gentrified over the past few years, but that is no reason that we should allow the Excelsior to downgrade. The Excelsior has always been a very diverse neighborhood with a high number of immigrants from all over the world, living in what I regards as a very mutually respectful and supportive environment. The neighborhood has a long an interesting history and also supports one of the highest proportions of kids and families in San Francisco. It is often referred to as "Working Class" by local news outlets, and it's true that there is much low-rent accommodation in and around Mission Street itself, however the neighborhood is far more

diverse than that. With properties selling for upwards of 500K, it is one of the best true San Francisco neighborhoods where ordinary middle class families such as mine have any chance of being able to own their own house in this great city.

Best Regards

Chuck Whelon
342 Paris Street
San Francisco
CA 94112

Cell: 415-516-4612
Studio/Fax: 415-333-8933

chuck@whelon.com
<http://www.whelon.com>

Miller, Alisa

From: Carlin DeCato [carlin.decato@gmail.com]
Sent: Saturday, October 12, 2013 2:41 PM
To: Chuck Whelon
Cc: Board of Supervisors; Miller, Alisa; Avalos, John; Hsieh, Frances; Pollock, Jeremy
Subject: file number #130084: Outer Mission Street Neighborhood Commercial District

file number #130084

On Fri, Oct 11, 2013 at 4:19 PM, Chuck Whelon <whelon@mac.com> wrote:
Dear Supervisors & Clerk for the Land use Committee,

As a home-owner and parent living in San Francisco's Excelsior district, I am writing this formal letter of support for limiting alcohol sales and fringe financial businesses, as well as preventing any additional Medical Cannabis Dispensaries anywhere along Geneva, or the Excelsior's Mission Street section

In particular, I support the legislation introduced by Supervisor Avalos earlier this year, to create an Outer Mission Street Neighborhood Commercial District (NCD), covering the Mission Street corridor from Trumbull to the San Francisco-San Mateo County border, and including business along Geneva.

I have lived in the Excelsior for over a decade now, and during that time I have found the neighborhood to be a pleasant, friendly and open place to live, and I have seen a gradual but steady improvement in the condition of properties and the businesses supported by the Mission Street Corridor (e.g. Library renovation, playgrounds, shops, restaurants, Balboa Park, McLaren Park). However, over the last year or so this trend seems to have reversed. I don't know if the cause is the general economy or something else, but businesses such as the online gambling casino "Net Stop" at 4458 Mission St (between Cotter St & Francis St) seem to be a contributing factor.

The opening of "Net Stop" has caused a marked increase in the number of people hanging out on the street in that area, and has generally caused a rise in the number of crimes reported in the vicinity of that business. This increase in crime seems to have been brought to a head in the tragic fatal shooting at the corner of Mission and Brazil this past Wednesday. Need I add that the incident occurred right outside the check-cashing business on that corner?

In my own personal experience, just a couple of weeks ago, I was walking home up Persia Street toward my home on Paris Street when I was punched in the head for no apparent reason by a rough-looking man that I did not know. The blow knocked me to the ground and left me with a mild concussion, but fortunately/strangely I was not actually robbed. As someone who suffers from Spina Bifida and has difficulty walking, I found the whole incident to be particularly distressing. Never before have I experienced anything remotely like this in this neighborhood. (SFPD Case # 130 738 884)

"Net Stop" itself is only 2 very short blocks from the San Francisco Community School (Elementary & Middle) and another block away is Monroe Elementary School. My son is in 6th Grade at SFCS right now, and I no longer feel safe in allowing him to walk alone to his school which is only a block and a half from our house, across Brazil Street.

I realize that some more central areas of Mission Street have become increasingly gentrified over the past few years, but that is no reason that we should allow the Excelsior to downgrade. The Excelsior has always been a very diverse neighborhood with a high number of immigrants from all over the world, living in what I regards

as a very mutually respectful and supportive environment. The neighborhood has a long and interesting history and also supports one of the highest proportions of kids and families in San Francisco. It is often referred to as "Working Class" by local news outlets, and it's true that there is much low-rent accommodation in and around Mission Street itself, however the neighborhood is far more diverse than that. With properties selling for upwards of 500K, it is one of the best true San Francisco neighborhoods where ordinary middle class families such as mine have any chance of being able to own their own house in this great city.

Best Regards

Chuck Whelon
342 Paris Street
San Francisco
CA 94112

Cell: 415-516-4612
Studio/Fax: 415-333-8933

chuck@whelon.com
<http://www.whelon.com>

Miller, Alisa

From: Carlin DeCato [carlin.decato@gmail.com]
Sent: Sunday, October 13, 2013 11:28 PM
To: Board of Supervisors
Cc: Miller, Alisa
Subject: I'm so worried about the altered childhood, children of 94112 are experiencing

ref file number #130084

Dear Supervisors.

I've lived on McLaren Ridge for 22 years , since before having children, with my husband.

The last 17 years since having children, I've volunteered my time towards community issues on both sides of this ridge (the portola and excelsior) to almost no avail of progress and I've waited and waited to see this neighborhood be given the attention and funds it needs in order to become safer and cleaner and a little more appealing. It's simply amazing to me as to how many resources are poured into other parts of this city while in the 94112, we can barely find a parking place for our shopping errands, there's hardly a decent grocery store, we look at trash 24/7, walk on broken sidewalks, and take great risks driving or walking the streets of this area.

Even with all this, I've somehow managed to raise two daughters here and as they've grown have attempted to give them a bit of freedom to ride the muni and walk to the park or a restaurant on Mission though every minute they are away from home I feel worried. I'm never sure what will go down and always overcome with the fear that they'll be in the wrong place at the wrong time. But there's something worse than these awful parental worries. It's actually the case now that my children no longer desire to go for walks in their neighborhood or go out exploring in any way. They are afraid. Scared not because of continually sensing their mother filled with anxiety. They are scared because of what they have directly seen and heard about over the years. It makes them feel insecure. What a terrible thing for children to not be able to go around their own neighborhood on foot or bikes with their friends....here in one of the most famous cities of America. Scared , insecure kids that don't feel the joy and confidence to enjoy and explore their home surroundings. This is a disaster in my mind. Something I wish I could change for all the children in this area because I know for a fact mine are not alone in this experience. Can you imagine ... kids that want to stay in the house, (and btw it's not because of video games or something like that) because it looks and feels so intimidating to be out alone or even with a friend. What type of childhood is this? How can this be in this day and age, here in the Golden State of California.

Something has to be done. We have to shut down the crime drawing establishments, whether it be prostitute rings, drug selling MCDs, liquor stores, grow houses, or gambling hangouts, and we especially have to deter, deflate, and eliminate the urban gangs and their turf war activities. And we need to clean up the merchant stretch as far as trash and signage as well.

How a shop such as NetStop was ever allowed into a lease on Mission Street is baffling to me. The same goes for MCD's within such close proximity to a public library and elementary schools.

I'm counting on your leadership to bring all of this under control for the sake of the children, ie the future citizens of SF and beyond.

Sincerely,

Carlin

Miller, Alisa

From: Jay [awritefellow@yahoo.com]
Sent: Friday, October 11, 2013 7:09 AM
To: Board of Supervisors; Avalos, John
Cc: Miller, Alisa
Subject: The Excelsior district asks for your attention

File number #130084

My wife, 3 boys and I are residents of the Excelsior district. I was born and raised here. My mother has owned a small business on Mission street for over 50 years. My wife moved here when she was a teenager and attended Balboa High School. When we married a few years ago we choose to move back here to raise our family.

We have seen the neighborhood change dramatically over the last 40 years: new waves of immigrant families in the 80s and 90s, cleaner streets and better infrastructure in the early 00s, an influx of new businesses (both large and small) in the last few years, and even more recently: greater community involvement to improve schools and social services in the area. All of which have added to and improved the fabric of the Excelsior neighborhood.

Those of us who've lived hear awhile agree: something special is happening here. There is a tangible momentum of change. We are transforming, yet we are managing to retain our character. I hear this even from people who live far from the southern corner of our city.

But as is the case with most neighborhoods in transition. The pendulum can swing wildly in the opposite direction at times.

There is a disturbing increase crime in the area. Just this week a man was gunned down a few blocks from my house in broad daylight. Illicit gambling operations have popped up like weeds along Mission and Geneva this year. Groups of thugs who harass ordinary people going about their days have begun occupying our street corners. There has even been a recent uptick in graffiti in the area; something I had seen decrease dramatically over the last five years.

In short, the Excelsior has made a number strides. Those strides literally took decades, and now I see them being undone in a matter of months. I find this incredibly disturbing and disheartening.

Of course, these challenges are not unique to the Excelsior or new to San Francisco, but I hope and expect city officials to agree that we can't let a neighborhood that has managed to lift itself up by its bootstraps, a community that has worked hard to become better and more self-sustaining, a part of the city that is actually improving while avoiding many of the problems of gentrification, fall back down again. That would truly be a travesty.

Increase foot patrols from our local police, a re-commitment to graffiti abatement, and cutting through the legal red-tape to shutter businesses that are clearly illegal: these are the actions we need now. Please join with community leaders in the Excelsior to make sure we solve these issues quickly and decisively.

Thank you,

Jay Rendon
1871 Alemany Blvd

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 ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN THAT the Land Use and Economic Development 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, October 21, 2013

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. 130084.** Ordinance amending the Planning Code to establish the Excelsior Outer Mission Street Neighborhood Commercial District (NCD) along Mission Street between Alemany Boulevard and the San Francisco-San Mateo County line; repealing the Excelsior Alcohol Restricted Use District and adding controls on liquor establishments to the new NCD; amending various sections to make conforming and other technical changes; amending the Zoning Map to rezone specified properties to the new NCD; and making environmental findings, and findings of consistency with the General Plan, and the eight priority policies of Planning Code, Section 101.1.

In accordance with San Francisco 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 a 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, Room 244, City Hall, 1 Dr. Carlton Goodlett Place, 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, October 18, 2013.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Angela Calvillo".

Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board

DATED: October 9, 2013

PUBLISHED/POSTED: October 11, 2013

CALIFORNIA NEWSPAPER SERVICE BUREAU

DAILY JOURNAL CORPORATION

Mailing Address : 915 E FIRST ST, LOS ANGELES, CA 90012
Telephone (213) 229-5300 / Fax (213) 229-5481
Visit us @ WWW.LEGALADSTORE.COM

Alisa Miller
S.F. BD OF SUPERVISORS (OFFICIAL NOTICES)
1 DR CARLTON B GOODLETT PL #244
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102

EXM 2545441

COPY OF NOTICE

Notice Type: GPN GOVT PUBLIC NOTICE
Ad Description AM - 10.21.13 Land Use Hearing - 130084

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):

10/11/2013

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.

Publication	\$264.06
NetTotal	\$237.65

Daily Journal Corporation

Serving your legal advertising needs throughout California. Call your local

BUSINESS JOURNAL, RIVERSIDE	(951) 784-0111
DAILY COMMERCE, LOS ANGELES	(213) 229-5300
LOS ANGELES DAILY JOURNAL, LOS ANGELES	(213) 229-5300
ORANGÉ COUNTY REPORTER, SANTA ANA	(714) 543-2027
SAN DIEGO COMMERCE, SAN DIEGO	(619) 232-3486
SAN FRANCISCO DAILY JOURNAL, SAN FRANCISCO	(800) 640-4829
SAN JOSE POST-RECORD, SAN JOSE	(408) 287-4866
THE DAILY RECORDER, SACRAMENTO	(916) 444-2355
THE INTER-CITY EXPRESS, OAKLAND	(510) 272-4747



* A 0 0 0 0 0 3 2 2 5 6 5 6 *

NOTICE OF
PUBLIC HEARING
BOARD OF
SUPERVISORS OF
THE CITY AND COUNTY
OF SAN FRANCISCO
LAND USE AND
ECONOMIC
DEVELOPMENT
COMMITTEE


OCTOBER 21, 2013
- 1:30 PM

LEGISLATIVE CHAMBER,
ROOM 250, CITY HALL
1 DR. CARLTON B.
GOODLETT PLACE,
SAN FRANCISCO, CA

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN THAT the Land Use and Economic Development 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. 130084.** Ordinance amending the Planning Code to establish the Excelsior Outer Mission Street Neighborhood Commercial District (NCD) along Mission Street between Alemany Boulevard and the San Francisco-San Mateo County line; repealing the Excelsior Alcohol Restricted Use District and adding controls on liquor establishments to the new NCD; amending various sections to make conforming and other technical changes; amending the Zoning Map to rezone specified properties to the new NCD; and making environmental findings, and findings of consistency with the General Plan, and the eight priority policies of Planning Code, Section 101.1.

In accordance with San Francisco 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 a 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, Room 244, City Hall, 1 Dr. Carlton Goodlett Place, 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, October 18, 2013. 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

February 6, 2013

File No. 130084

Bill Wycko
Environmental Review Officer
Planning Department
1650 Mission Street, 4th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94103

Dear Mr. Wycko:

On January 29, 2013, Supervisor Avalos introduced the following proposed legislation:

File No. 130084

Ordinance amending the Planning Code, by adding a new section, to establish the Outer Mission Street Neighborhood Commercial District along Mission Street between Alemany Boulevard and the San Francisco-San Mateo County line; repealing the Excelsior Alcohol Restricted Use District and adding controls on liquor establishments to the new Neighborhood Commercial District; amending various sections to make conforming and other technical changes; amending the Zoning Map to rezone specified properties to the new Neighborhood Commercial District; and making environmental findings, Planning Code, Section 302, findings, and findings of consistency with the General Plan, and the Priority Policies of Planning Code, Section 101.1.

This legislation is being transmitted to you for environmental review, pursuant to Planning Code Section 306.7(c).

Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Alisa Miller".

By: Alisa Miller, Committee Clerk
Land Use & Economic Development Committee

Attachment

c: Monica Pereira, Environmental Planning
Joy Navarrete, 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

February 6, 2013

Planning Commission
Attn: Jonas Ionin
1660 Mission Street, 5th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94103

Dear Commissioners:

On January 29, 2013, Supervisor Avalos introduced the following proposed legislation:

File No. 130084

Ordinance amending the Planning Code, by adding a new section, to establish the Outer Mission Street Neighborhood Commercial District along Mission Street between Alemany Boulevard and the San Francisco-San Mateo County line; repealing the Excelsior Alcohol Restricted Use District and adding controls on liquor establishments to the new Neighborhood Commercial District; amending various sections to make conforming and other technical changes; amending the Zoning Map to rezone specified properties to the new Neighborhood Commercial District; and making environmental findings, Planning Code, Section 302, findings, and findings of consistency with the General Plan, and the Priority Policies of Planning Code, Section 101.1.

The proposed ordinance is being transmitted pursuant to Planning Code Section 302(b) for public hearing and recommendation. The ordinance is pending before the Land Use & Economic Development Committee and will be scheduled for hearing upon receipt of your response.

Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Alisa Miller".

By: Alisa Miller, Committee Clerk
Land Use & Economic Development Committee

- c: John Rahaim, Director of Planning
Scott Sanchez, Zoning Administrator
Bill Wycko, Chief, Major Environmental Analysis
AnMarie Rodgers, Legislative Affairs
Monica Pereira, Environmental Planning
Joy Navarrete, 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: Tom Hui, Acting Director, Department of Building Inspection

FROM: Alisa Miller, Clerk, Land Use and Economic Development Committee
Board of Supervisors

DATE: February 6, 2013

SUBJECT: LEGISLATION INTRODUCED

The Board of Supervisors' Land Use and Economic Development Committee has received the following proposed ordinance, introduced by Supervisor Avalos on January 29, 2013:

File No. 130084

Ordinance amending the Planning Code, by adding a new section, to establish the Outer Mission Street Neighborhood Commercial District along Mission Street between Alemany Boulevard and the San Francisco-San Mateo County line; repealing the Excelsior Alcohol Restricted Use District and adding controls on liquor establishments to the new Neighborhood Commercial District; amending various sections to make conforming and other technical changes; amending the Zoning Map to rezone specified properties to the new Neighborhood Commercial District; and making environmental findings, Planning Code, Section 302, findings, and findings of consistency with the General Plan, and the Priority Policies of Planning Code, Section 101.1.

If you have any 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.

c: William Strawn, Department of Building Inspection
Carolyn Jayin, Department of Building Inspection

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: Ed Reiskin, Director, Municipal Transportation Agency
Greg Suhr, Chief, Police Department
John Rahaim, Director, Planning Department
Regina Dick-Endrizzi, Director, Small Business Commission
Kriztina Palone, Director, Neighborhood Services

FROM: Alisa Miller, Clerk, Land Use and Economic Development Committee
Board of Supervisors

DATE: February 5, 2013

SUBJECT: LEGISLATION INTRODUCED

The Board of Supervisors' Land Use and Economic Development Committee has received the following proposed legislation, introduced by Supervisor Avalos on January 29, 2013. This matter is being referred to your department for informational purposes.

File: 130084

Ordinance amending the Planning Code, by adding a new section, to establish the Outer Mission Street Neighborhood Commercial District along Mission Street between Alemany Boulevard and the San Francisco-San Mateo County line; repealing the Excelsior Alcohol Restricted Use District and adding controls on liquor establishments to the new Neighborhood Commercial District; amending various sections to make conforming and other technical changes; amending the Zoning Map to rezone specified properties to the new Neighborhood Commercial District; and making environmental findings, Planning Code, Section 302, findings, and findings of consistency with the General Plan and the Priority Policies of Planning Code, Section 101.1.

If you do wish to submit any additional reports or documentation to be included as part of the file, please send those to me at the Board of Supervisors, City Hall, Room 244, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, San Francisco, CA 94102.

c: Kate Breen, Municipal Transportation Agency
Janet Martinsen, Municipal Transportation Agency

Christine Fountain, Office Manager, Police Department
John Monroe, Secretary, Police Commission
Scott Sanchez, Zoning Administrator, Planning Department
Bill Wycko, Chief, Major Environmental Analysis, Planning Department
AnMarie Rodgers, Legislative Affairs, Planning Department
Monica Pereira, Environmental Planning, Planning Department
Joy Navarrete, Environmental Planning, Planning Department
Chris Schulman, Commission Secretary, Small Business Commission
Luis Figueroa, Deputy Community Manager, Neighborhood Services

Introduction Form

By a Member of the Board of Supervisors or the Mayor

Time stamp
or meeting date

I hereby submit the following item for introduction (select only one):

- 1. For reference to Committee:
- An ordinance, resolution, motion, or charter amendment.
- 2. Request for next printed agenda without reference to Committee.
- 3. Request for hearing on a subject matter at Committee:
- 4. Request for letter beginning "Supervisor inquires"
- 5. City Attorney request.
- 6. Call File No. from Committee.
- 7. Budget Analyst request (attach written motion).
- 8. Substitute Legislation File No.
- 9. Request for Closed Session (attach written motion).
- 10. Board to Sit as A Committee of the Whole.
- 11. Question(s) submitted for Mayoral Appearance before the BOS on

Please check the appropriate boxes. The proposed legislation should be forwarded to the following:

- Small Business Commission
- Youth Commission
- Ethics Commission
- Planning Commission
- Building Inspection Commission


Note: For the Imperative Agenda (a resolution not on the printed agenda), use a different form.

Sponsor(s):

Subject:

The text is listed below or attached:

Signature of Sponsoring Supervisor: _____



For Clerk's Use Only:

Introduction Form

By a Member of the Board of Supervisors or the Mayor

Time stamp
or meeting date

I hereby submit the following item for introduction (select only one):

- 1. For reference to Committee:
An ordinance, resolution, motion, or charter amendment.
- 2. Request for next printed agenda without reference to Committee.
- 3. Request for hearing on a subject matter at Committee:
- 4. Request for letter beginning "Supervisor inquires"
- 5. City Attorney request.
- 6. Call File No. from Committee.
- 7. Budget Analyst request (attach written motion).
- 8. Substitute Legislation File No.
- 9. Request for Closed Session (attach written motion).
- 10. Board to Sit as A Committee of the Whole.
- 11. Question(s) submitted for Mayoral Appearance before the BOS on

Please check the appropriate boxes. The proposed legislation should be forwarded to the following:

- Small Business Commission
- Youth Commission
- Ethics Commission
- Planning Commission
- Building Inspection Commission


Note: For the Imperative Agenda (a resolution not on the printed agenda), use a different form.

Sponsor(s):

Subject:

The text is listed below or attached:

Signature of Sponsoring Supervisor:



For Clerk's Use Only:

130084 ✓