

File No. 200660 Committee Item No. 3  
Board Item No. 15

**COMMITTEE/BOARD OF SUPERVISORS**  
AGENDA PACKET CONTENTS LIST

Committee: Land Use and Transportation Committee Date March 1, 2021

Board of Supervisors Meeting Date March 9, 2021

**Cmte Board**

- |                                     |                                     |  |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/>            | Motion                                       |
| <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/>            | Resolution                                   |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Ordinance                                    |
| <input 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 type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/>            | Introduction Form                            |
| <input 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 type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/>            | Public Correspondence                        |

**OTHER (Use back side if additional space is needed)**

- |                                     |                                     |                                     |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <u>PC Reso No. 20328 102518</u>     |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <u>PLN Executive Summary 102518</u> |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <u>PLN Transmittal 030220</u>       |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <u>Hearing Notice 030121</u>        |
| <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <u>_____</u>                        |
| <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <u>_____</u>                        |
| <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <u>_____</u>                        |
| <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <u>_____</u>                        |
| <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <u>_____</u>                        |
| <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <u>_____</u>                        |
| <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <u>_____</u>                        |
| <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <u>_____</u>                        |

Completed by: Erica Major Date February 26, 2021  
Completed by: Erica Major Date March 3, 2021

1 [Zoning Map - Rezoning of 118-134 Kissling Street]

2

3 **Ordinance amending the Planning Code by revising Zoning Map Sheet No. ZN07 to**  
 4 **rezone Assessor's Parcel Block No. 3516, Lot Nos. 039, 040, 041, and 042 (118-134**  
 5 **Kissling Street) from Residential Enclave District to Residential Enclave District -**  
 6 **Mixed; affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California**  
 7 **Environmental Quality Act; making findings of public necessity, convenience, and**  
 8 **welfare under Planning Code, Section 302; and making findings of consistency with the**  
 9 **General Plan, and the eight priority policies of Planning Code, Section 101.1.**

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

14

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

16

17 Section 1. Findings.

18 (a) The Planning Department has determined that the actions contemplated in this  
 19 ordinance comply with the California Environmental Quality Act (California Public Resources  
 20 Code Section 21000 et seq.). Said determination is on file with the Clerk of the Board of  
 21 Supervisors in File No. 200660 and is incorporated herein by reference. The Board affirms  
 22 this determination.

23 (b) Pursuant to Planning Code Section 302, this Board finds that the actions  
 24 contemplated in this ordinance will serve the public necessity, convenience, and welfare for  
 25 the reasons set forth in Planning Commission Resolution No. 20328 and the Board

1 incorporates such reasons herein by reference. A copy of the Planning Commission  
2 Resolution No. 20328 is on file with the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors in File No. 200660.

3 (c) This Board finds that the actions contemplated in this ordinance are consistent  
4 with the General Plan and with the Priority Policies of Planning Code Section 101.1 for the  
5 reasons set forth in Planning Commission Resolution No. 20328 and the Board hereby  
6 incorporates such reasons herein by reference.  
7

8 Section 2. The Planning Code is hereby amended by revising Sheet ZN07 of the Zoning  
9 Map of the City and County of San Francisco, as follows:  
10

	<u>Use District</u>	<u>Use District</u>
<u>Description of Property</u>	<u>to be Superseded</u>	<u>Hereby Approved</u>
Block 3516, Lots 039, 040, 041, & 042	RED	RED-MX

15  
16 Section 3. Effective Date. This ordinance shall become effective 30 days after  
17 enactment. Enactment occurs when the Mayor signs the ordinance, the Mayor returns the  
18 ordinance unsigned or does not sign the ordinance within ten days of receiving it, or the Board  
19 of Supervisors overrides the Mayor's veto of the ordinance.  
20

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

23 By: /s/  
24 KATE H. STACY  
25 Deputy City Attorney

n:\land\as2020\9690392\01457086.docx



# SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

---

## Planning Commission Resolution No. 20328

HEARING DATE: OCTOBER 25, 2018

*Case No.:* 2016-012474MAP  
*Project Address:* 118-134 KISSLING STREET  
*Zoning:* RED (Residential Enclave) Zoning District  
40-X Height and Bulk District  
*Block/Lot:* 3516/039, 040, 041, and 042  
*Project Sponsor:* John Kevlin  
Reuben, Junius, & Rose  
One Bush Street, Suite 600  
San Francisco, CA 94104  
*Staff Contact:* Esmeralda Jardines – (415) 575-9144  
[esmeralda.jardines@sfgov.org](mailto:esmeralda.jardines@sfgov.org)

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 AMENDMENT THAT WOULD REZONE THE SUBJECT PROPERTY FROM RED (RESIDENTIAL ENCLAVE) TO RED-MX (RESIDENTIAL ENCLAVE-MIXED) ZONING DISTRICT AND ADOPTING ENVIRONMENTAL FINDINGS AND FINDINGS OF CONSISTENCY WITH THE PRIORITY POLICIES OF PLANNING CODE SECTION 101.1 AND THE GENERAL PLAN.

WHEREAS, on September 27, 2016, John Kevlin of Rueben, Junius & Rose, on behalf of Michael Hansen & Jo-Ann Hansen, Judith Long (Property Owner), filed an application with the San Francisco Planning Department for a Zoning Map Amendment, as detailed in Case Number 2016-012474MAP; and

WHEREAS, the Zoning Map Amendment would amend San Francisco Zoning Map Sheet No. ZN07 to rezone Block 3516, Lot Nos: 039 (118-120 Kissling Street), 040 (124 Kissling Street), 041 (130 Kissling Street), and 042 (134 Kissling Street) from RED (Residential Enclave) to RED-MX (Residential Enclave-Mixed) Zoning District; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission (hereinafter "Commission") conducted a duly noticed public hearing to consider the initiation of the proposed Ordinance on October 19, 2017; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Department has determined the proposed Planning Code amendment is subject to a Categorical Exemption from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) pursuant to Section 15060(c)2 of the Guidelines for Implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act for activities that will not result in a direct or reasonably foreseeable indirect physical change in the environment; and,

WHEREAS, on March 2, 2016, the proposed project was determined to be exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) under CEQA State Guidelines 15311, or Class 11. On October 20, 2016 the Project Sponsor proposed a modification to the approved project. On August 8, 2017, in accordance

with Chapter 31 of the Administrative Code, the Planning Department determined the modification of the CEQA exempt project did not constitute a substantial modification of the 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 Department staff and other interested parties; and

WHEREAS, the 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

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission finds from the facts presented that the public necessity, convenience, and general welfare require the proposed amendment; and

MOVED, that the Planning Commission hereby **approves** the proposed ordinance.

## **FINDINGS**

Having reviewed the materials identified in the preamble above, and having heard all testimony and arguments, this Commission finds, concludes, and determines as follows:

1. **General Plan Compliance.** The proposed Ordinance and the Commission's recommended modifications are *consistent* with the following Objectives and Policies of the General Plan:

## **COMMERCE AND INDUSTRY ELEMENT**

### **Objectives and Policies**

#### **OBJECTIVE 2:**

**MAINTAIN AND ENHANCE A SOUND AND DIVERSE ECONOMIC BASE AND FISCAL STRUCTURE FOR THE CITY.**

#### **Policy 2.1**

Seek to retain existing commercial and industrial activity and do attract new such activity to the City.

*The proposed amendment would permit a PDR business to retain the existing automotive repair use (DBA Royal Motors) which occupies an approximately 62,000 sq. ft. site by allowing an expansion that would provide additional vehicle storage and service capacity to better ensure its long term viability at the subject site. The additional vehicle storage capacity will allow Royal Motors to deliver cars to dealerships and owners more rapidly than currently possible. Thus, an industrial business will be allowed to expand and remain in San Francisco. Currently, the RED (Residential Enclave) Zoning District does not permit an enclosed lot for vehicle storage. However, this land use is conditionally permitted in the RED-MX (Residential Enclave-Mixed) Zoning District. Without the rezoning, this use would not be permitted and the existing industrial business would not be permitted to grow in capacity.*



**OBJECTIVE 3**

**PROVIDE EXPANDED EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES FOR CITY RESIDENTS, PARTICULARLY THE UNDEREMPLOYED AND ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED.**

**Policy 3.1**

Promote the attraction, retention, and expansion of commercial and industrial firms, which provide employment improvement opportunities for unskilled and semi-skilled workers.

**OBJECTIVE 4:**

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

**Policy 4.3**

Carefully consider public actions that displace existing viable industrial firms.

**Policy 4.4**

When displacement does occur, attempt to relocate desired firms within the city.

**Policy 4.6**

Assist in the provision of available land for site expansion.

**Policy 4.10**

Enhance the working environment within the industrial areas.

*The proposed amendment promotes the attraction, retention, and expansion of the existing automotive repair use by enhancing its operational capacity and thereby, providing the potential for expanded employment opportunities. The existing automotive repair facility provides on-going job opportunities to mechanics and to trade-skilled workers.*

**URBAN DESIGN ELEMENT**

**Objectives and Policies**

**OBJECTIVE 1:**

**EMPHASIS OF THE CHARACTERISTIC PATTERN, WHICH GIVES TO THE CITY AND ITS NEIGHBORHOODS AN IMAGE, A SENSE OF PURPOSE, AND A MEANS OF ORIENTATION.**

**Policy 1.3**

Recognize that buildings, when seen together, produce a total effect that characterizes the city and its districts.

**Policy 1.7**

Recognize the natural boundaries of districts, and promote connections between districts.

**WESTERN SOMA AREA PLAN**

## LAND USE

### OBJECTIVE 1.2

**ENCOURAGE PRESERVATION OF EXISTING AND VIABLY APPROPRIATE NEW LAND USES IN LOCATIONS THAT PROVIDE THE GREATEST OPPORTUNITIES FOR SUCCESS AND MINIMIZE CONFLICT WITH RESIDENTIAL USES.**

*The amendment permits the preservation of the existing automotive repair use (DBA Royal Motors) by providing additional vehicle storage that will enhance the existing operational capacity. The proposed enhancements (see case no. 2016-012474CUA), complement the existing automotive repair facility use and will better ensure the long-term viability of the facility at the site.*

## NEIGHBORHOOD ECONOMY

### OBJECTIVE 2.1

**RETAIN AND ENCOURAGE GROWTH OPPORTUNITIES FOR EXISTING BUSINESSES.**

#### Policy 2.1.1

Promote a wide range of neighborhood-serving commercial uses north of Harrison Street.

*The amendment promotes the retention and growth of the existing automotive repair business by legalizing the expansion of the site's capacity for vehicle service and storage while not disrupting any existing buildings, currently not permitted in the RED but conditionally permitted in the RED-MX. The existing use is one of the few remaining large-scale automotive repair facilities within the neighborhood. The amendment would allow the facility to legally continue servicing vehicles, storing them on-site, and continue washing vehicles as they are prepared for delivery either to showrooms or to their owners. The rezoning would thus permit Planning Code compliance.*

## URBAN DESIGN AND BUILT FORM

### OBJECTIVE 5.1

**REINFORCE THE DIVERSITY OF THE EXISTING BUILT FORM AND THE WAREHOUSE, INDUSTRIAL AND ALLEY CHARACTER.**

#### Policy 2.1.1

Develop design standards that preserve the industrial character of the larger streets, the mixed industrial/residential character of the RED-Mixed areas, and the residential character of the REDs.

*The proposed amendment would change the zoning from RED to RED-MX. Nevertheless, the architectural screen wall that is proposed per case no. 2016-012474CUA, is well-integrated with the existing architecture and compatible with the mixed-use, light-industrial character of the surrounding neighborhood context. The screen wall maintains a well-defined street wall with a color and height that matches the existing building while the three-dimensional form contributes to the visual diversity of the use. The materiality of the proposed screen wall is metal which is consistent with many of the light-industrial buildings found in the surrounding neighborhood. The Project will improve the streetscape by providing a permeable landscape buffer between the proposed screen wall and the public right-of-way.*

*Accent lighting will further soften and accentuate the landscaping and screen wall at night, which will better activate the street frontages and relate to the residential character also found within the surrounding neighborhood. Thus, the Urban Design objectives and policies would still apply to both RED to RED-MX.*

#### **OBJECTIVE 10.4**

**ENSURE A HIGH QUALITY OF LIFE FOR EXISTING AND NEW RESIDENTS AND WORKERS.**

##### **Policy 10.4.1**

Significantly enhance pedestrian safety throughout Western SoMa.

*The proposed amendment would permit the Project site to enhance pedestrian safety around the site by eliminating an existing 46-ft 6-in. curb cut along Kissling Street by expanding a vehicle storage facility in the RED-MX. Vehicular access to vehicle storage will be limited to one point along Kissling Street; instead of the current three access points. In addition, the Howard Street curb cut will continue to be used to access the existing car wash facility; thereby, reducing the amount of vehicles accessing the site.*

*On balance, the Project is consistent with the Objectives and Policies of the General Plan.*

2. **Planning Code Section 101.1(b)** establishes eight priority-planning policies. The proposed amendments to the Planning Code are consistent with the eight Priority Policies set forth in Section 101.1(b) of the Planning Code in that:

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

*The proposed amendment would not affect neighborhood-serving retail uses because the project site does not possess any. Thus, no existing neighborhood-serving uses would be displaced or otherwise adversely affected by the proposal.*

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

*The proposed amendment would not affect existing housing and neighborhood character. Residential uses are permitted in both the RED and RED-MX. Thus, if the proposed vehicle storage stacker use were to change to residential, the aforementioned would still be permitted in a RED-MX.*

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

*The proposed amendment would not affect supply of housing. Residential uses are permitted in both the RED and RED-MX; therefore, inclusionary housing would be required in both zoning districts accordingly. Thus, if the proposed vehicle storage stacker use were to change to residential, the aforementioned would still be required pursuant to Planning Code Section 415 in a RED-MX.*

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



*The proposed amendment would not impede MUNI transit service or adversely impact street circulation or parking.*

5. That a diverse economic base be maintained by protecting our industrial and service sectors from displacement due to commercial office development, and that future opportunities for resident employment and ownership in these sectors be enhanced;

*The amendment would permit an existing PDR use to expand and remain in San Francisco; thus, bolstering the industrial sector, which is a priority for the City. The Project incorporates an expanded PDR use which assists in further diversifying the neighborhood character and the RED-MX Zoning District.*

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

*While the proposed amendment would not modify any physical parameters of the Planning Code or other Codes, the proposal could improve the effectiveness of an existing PDR business facilities as it pursues upgrades to its site. Therefore, the proposed amendment would promote the greatest possible preparedness to protect against injury and loss of life in an earthquake.*

7. That the landmarks and historic buildings be preserved;

*The proposed amendment would not impact any City Landmarks or historic buildings. The Department finds that the amendment is consistent with the historic industrial character of the surrounding eligible historic district (Western SoMa Light Industrial and Residential Historic District).*

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


*The proposed amendment would not adversely affect any nearby open space.*

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Commission hereby recommends that the Board ADOPT the proposed Ordinance as described in this Resolution and in the proposed Ordinance with the modification to increase the administrative penalty fee as assessed by the Zoning Administrator per amended Planning Code Section 176 from up to \$200.00 a day to up to \$250.00 a day.

**Protest of Fee or Exaction:** You may protest any fee or exaction subject to Government Code Section 66000 that is imposed as a condition of approval by following the procedures set forth in Government Code Section 66020. The protest must satisfy the requirements of Government Code Section 66020(a) and must be filed within 90 days of the date of the first approval or conditional approval of the development referencing the challenged fee or exaction. For purposes of Government Code Section 66020, the date of imposition of the fee shall be the date of the earliest discretionary approval by the City of the subject development.

If the City has not previously given Notice of an earlier discretionary approval of the project, the Planning Commission's adoption of this Motion, Resolution, Discretionary Review Action or the Zoning Administrator's Variance Decision Letter constitutes the approval or conditional approval of the development and the City hereby gives NOTICE that the 90-day protest period under Government Code Section 66020 has begun. If the City has already given Notice that the 90-day approval period has begun for the subject development, then this document does not re-commence the 90-day approval period.

I hereby certify that the foregoing Resolution was adopted by the Commission at its meeting on October 25, 2018.



Jonas P. Ionin  
Commission Secretary

AYES: Hillis, Johnson, Melgar, Richards

NOES: None

ABSENT: Fong, Koppel, Moore

ADOPTED: October 25, 2018



# SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

---

## Executive Summary Zoning Map Amendment

HEARING DATE: OCTOBER 25, 2018

*Project Name:* 118-134 Kissling Street  
*Case Number:* 2016-012474MAP [Board File No. TBD]  
*Initiated by:* Planning Commission, per Applicant Request  
*Staff Contact:* Esmeralda Jardines, Current Planning  
esmeralda.jardines@sfgov.org, 415-575-9144  
*Reviewed by:* Richard Sucre, Principal Planner, Southeast Team, Current Planning  
richard.sucre@sfgov.org, 415-575-9108  
*Recommendation:* **Approval**

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

Reception:  
**415.558.6378**

Fax:  
**415.558.6409**

Planning  
Information:  
**415.558.6377**

### ZONING MAP AMENDMENT

The proposed Zoning Map Amendment to San Francisco Map Sheet No. ZN07 would rezone Block No. 3516 and Lot Nos. 039 (118-120 Kissling Street), 040 (124 Kissling Street), 041 (130 Kissling Street), and 042 (134 Kissling Street) from RED (Residential Enclave) to RED-MX (Residential Enclave-Mixed) Zoning District.

#### The Way It Is Now:

San Francisco Map Sheet No. ZN07 identifies Block No. 3516 and Lot Nos. 039 (118-120 Kissling Street), 040 (124 Kissling Street), 041 (130 Kissling Street), and 042 (134 Kissling Street) as within the RED (Residential Enclave) Zoning District.

#### The Way It Would Be:

San Francisco Map Sheet No. ZN07 would identify Block No. 3516 and Lot Nos. 039 (118-120 Kissling Street), 040 (124 Kissling Street), 041 (130 Kissling Street), and 042 (134 Kissling Street) as within the RED-MX (Residential Enclave-Mixed) Zoning District.

### BACKGROUND

On March 10, 2016, the Planning Commission approved Motion No. 19588 adopting findings relating to the approval of Conditional Use Authorization, pursuant to Planning Code Sections 157.1, 303, and 844.71, for enclosed vehicle storage for a project proposing to establish three four-level stacker storage structures with a total of 132 spaces for an existing automotive repair facility within the WMUG (Western SoMa Mixed Use-General) District and 55-X Height and Bulk District, and adopting findings under the California Environmental Quality Act. This project was phase one of an automotive repair expansion for the entity (DBA Royal Motors).

On October 19, 2017, the Planning Commission initiated the rezoning of the subject parcel per Planning Commission Resolution No. 20031.

On October 25, 2018, the Planning Commission will hear and consider phase two of this automotive repair expansion (see Case no. 2016-012474CUA). The Planning Commission must adopt findings relating to the approval of Conditional Use Authorization, pursuant to Planning Code Sections 303, 823, and

847.58, to permit the construction of vehicle storage stackers with 96 spaces serving an existing automotive repair use (DBA Royal Automotive Group) with a new screen wall along Kissling Street located at 118-134 Kissling Street, Lots: 039, 040, 041, and 042 in Assessor's Block 3516, within the Residential Enclave-Mixed Zoning District and a 40-X Height and Bulk District, and adopting findings under the California Environmental Quality Act.

## **ISSUES AND CONSIDERATIONS**

- **Vehicle Storage-Enclosed Lot.** Planning Code Section 813.58 states Vehicle Storage-Enclosed Lot, as defined by Planning Code Section 890.132, is not permitted in the Residential Enclave Zoning District. Planning Code Section 847.58 states that a Conditional Use Authorization is required for Vehicle Storage-Enclosed Lot, as defined by Planning Code Section 890.132 in the Residential Enclave-Mixed Zoning District. Without the rezoning, the existing and intended use at 118-134 Kissling Street would not be permitted. Therefore, a local industrial business would not be permitted to grow and expand at its current site.

## **GENERAL PLAN COMPLIANCE**

### **COMMERCE AND INDUSTRY ELEMENT**

#### **Objectives and Policies**

##### **OBJECTIVE 2:**

**MAINTAIN AND ENHANCE A SOUND AND DIVERSE ECONOMIC BASE AND FISCAL STRUCTURE FOR THE CITY.**

##### **Policy 2.1**

Seek to retain existing commercial and industrial activity and do attract new such activity to the City.

*The proposed amendment would permit a PDR business to retain the existing automotive repair use (DBA Royal Motors) which occupies an approximately 62,000 sq. ft. site by allowing an expansion that would provide additional vehicle storage and service capacity to better ensure its long term viability at the subject site. The additional vehicle storage capacity will allow Royal Motors to deliver cars to dealerships and owners more rapidly than currently possible. Thus, an industrial business will be allowed to expand and remain in San Francisco. Currently, the RED (Residential Enclave) Zoning District does not permit an enclosed lot for vehicle storage. However, this land use is conditionally permitted in the RED-MX (Residential Enclave-Mixed) Zoning District. Without the rezoning, this use would not be permitted and the existing industrial business would not be permitted to grow in capacity.*

##### **OBJECTIVE 3**

**PROVIDE EXPANDED EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES FOR CITY RESIDENTS, PARTICULARLY THE UNDEREMPLOYED AND ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED.**



**Policy 3.1**

Promote the attraction, retention, and expansion of commercial and industrial firms, which provide employment improvement opportunities for unskilled and semi-skilled workers.

**OBJECTIVE 4:**

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

**Policy 4.3**

Carefully consider public actions that displace existing viable industrial firms.

**Policy 4.4**

When displacement does occur, attempt to relocate desired firms within the city.

**Policy 4.6**

Assist in the provision of available land for site expansion.

**Policy 4.10**

Enhance the working environment within the industrial areas.

*The proposed amendment promotes the attraction, retention, and expansion of the existing automotive repair use by enhancing its operational capacity and thereby, providing the potential for expanded employment opportunities. The existing automotive repair facility provides on-going job opportunities to mechanics and to trade-skilled workers.*

**URBAN DESIGN ELEMENT**

**Objectives and Policies**

**OBJECTIVE 1:**

**EMPHASIS OF THE CHARACTERISTIC PATTERN, WHICH GIVES TO THE CITY AND ITS NEIGHBORHOODS AN IMAGE, A SENSE OF PURPOSE, AND A MEANS OF ORIENTATION.**

**Policy 1.3**

Recognize that buildings, when seen together, produce a total effect that characterizes the city and its districts.

**Policy 1.7**

Recognize the natural boundaries of districts, and promote connections between districts.

## WESTERN SOMA AREA PLAN

### LAND USE

#### OBJECTIVE 1.2

**ENCOURAGE PRESERVATION OF EXISTING AND VIABLY APPROPRIATE NEW LAND USES IN LOCATIONS THAT PROVIDE THE GREATEST OPPORTUNITIES FOR SUCCESS AND MINIMIZE CONFLICT WITH RESIDENTIAL USES.**

*The amendment permits the preservation of the existing automotive repair use (DBA Royal Motors) by providing additional vehicle storage that will enhance the existing operational capacity. The proposed enhancements (see Case No. 2016-012474CUA), complement the existing automotive repair facility use and will better ensure the long-term viability of the facility at the site.*

### NEIGHBORHOOD ECONOMY

#### OBJECTIVE 2.1

**RETAIN AND ENCOURAGE GROWTH OPPORTUNITIES FOR EXISTING BUSINESSES.**

##### Policy 2.1.1

Promote a wide range of neighborhood-serving commercial uses north of Harrison Street.

*The amendment promotes the retention and growth of the existing automotive repair business by legalizing the expansion of the site's capacity for vehicle service and storage while not disrupting any existing buildings, currently not permitted in the RED but conditionally permitted in the RED-MX. The existing use is one of the few remaining large-scale automotive repair facilities within the neighborhood. The amendment would allow the facility to legally continue servicing vehicles, storing them on-site, and continue washing vehicles as they are prepared for delivery either to showrooms or to their owners. The rezoning would thus permit Planning Code compliance.*

### URBAN DESIGN AND BUILT FORM

#### OBJECTIVE 5.1

**REINFORCE THE DIVERSITY OF THE EXISTING BUILT FORM AND THE WAREHOUSE, INDUSTRIAL AND ALLEY CHARACTER.**

##### Policy 2.1.1

Develop design standards that preserve the industrial character of the larger streets, the mixed industrial/residential character of the RED-Mixed areas, and the residential character of the REDs.

*The proposed amendment would change the zoning from RED to RED-MX. Nevertheless, the architectural screen wall that is proposed per case no. 2016-012474CUA, is well-integrated with the existing architecture and compatible with the mixed-use, light-industrial character of the surrounding neighborhood context. The screen wall maintains a well-defined street wall with a color and height that matches the existing building while the three-dimensional form contributes to the visual diversity of the use. The materiality of the proposed screen wall is metal which is consistent*

*with many of the light-industrial buildings found in the surrounding neighborhood. The Project will improve the streetscape by providing a permeable landscape buffer between the proposed screen wall and the public right-of-way. Accent lighting will further soften and accentuate the landscaping and screen wall at night, which will better activate the street frontages and relate to the residential character also found within the surrounding neighborhood. Thus, the Urban Design objectives and policies would still apply to both RED to RED-MX.*

#### **OBJECTIVE 10.4**

#### **ENSURE A HIGH QUALITY OF LIFE FOR EXISTING AND NEW RESIDENTS AND WORKERS.**

##### **Policy 10.4.1**

Significantly enhance pedestrian safety throughout Western SoMa.

*The proposed amendment would permit the Project site to enhance pedestrian safety around the site by eliminating an existing 46-ft 6-in. curb cut along Kissling Street by expanding a vehicle storage facility in the RED-MX. Vehicular access to vehicle storage will be limited to one point along Kissling Street; instead of the current three access points. In addition, the Howard Street curb cut will continue to be used to access the existing car wash facility; thereby, reducing the amount of vehicles accessing the site.*

#### **IMPLEMENTATION**

The Department has determined that this ordinance will not impact our current implementation procedures.

#### **RECOMMENDATION**

The Department recommends that the Commission *approve* the proposed Ordinance and adopt the attached Draft Resolution.

#### **BASIS FOR RECOMMENDATION**

The Residential Enclave-Mixed District (RED-MX) encompasses some of the clusters of low-scale, medium density, predominantly residential neighborhoods located along the narrow side streets of the Western SoMa area. Many parcels in these residential enclaves are underdeveloped and represent opportunities for new residential and low-intensity commercial uses as well as some automobile-related and production, distribution, and repair uses. The proposed Zoning Map Amendment to San Francisco Map Sheet No. ZN07 that would rezone Block No. 3516 and Lot Nos. 039 (118-120 Kissling Street), 040 (124 Kissling Street), 041 (130 Kissling Street), and 042 (134 Kissling Street) from RED (Residential Enclave) to RED-MX (Residential Enclave-Mixed) Zoning District would permit an existing industrial business that has occupied the site for over 40 years to remain and expand in its current location.

#### **REQUIRED COMMISSION ACTION**

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

#### **ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW**

The Planning Department has determined the proposed Planning Code amendment is subject to a Categorical Exemption from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) pursuant to Section

15060(c)2 of the Guidelines for Implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act for activities that will not result in a direct or reasonably foreseeable indirect physical change in the environment; and,

On March 2, 2016, the proposed project was determined to be exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) under CEQA State Guidelines 15311, or Class 11. On October 20, 2016 the Project Sponsor proposed a modification to the approved project. On August 8, 2017, in accordance with Chapter 31 of the Administrative Code, the Planning Department determined the modification of the CEQA exempt project did not constitute a substantial modification of the Project.

## **PUBLIC COMMENT**

As of the date of this report, the Planning Department has one public comment regarding the proposed Ordinance. The Department has received correspondence from Marvis Phillips, Board Chair for District 6 Community Planners. Mr. Phillips explained that the District 6 Community Planners are in support of the “stackers” for the automotive repair facility. They are also in support of creating the RED-MX Zoning District. The aforementioned encourage the Planning Commission to support small businesses and approve the items.

## **ATTACHMENTS:**

- Exhibit A: Draft Planning Commission Resolution
- Exhibit B: Maps and Context Photographs
- Exhibit C: Board of Supervisors File No. XXXXX
- Exhibit D: CEQA Categorical Exemption Determination
- Exhibit E: Public Correspondence
- Exhibit F: Planning Commission Resolution No. 20031 - Initiation





# SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

---

## Planning Commission Draft Resolution

HEARING DATE: OCTOBER 25, 2018

*Case No.:* **2016-012474MAP**  
*Project Address:* **118-134 KISSLING STREET**  
*Zoning:* RED (Residential Enclave) Zoning District  
40-X Height and Bulk District  
*Block/Lot:* 3516/039, 040, 041, and 042  
*Project Sponsor:* John Kevlin  
Reuben, Junius, & Rose  
One Bush Street, Suite 600  
San Francisco, CA 94104  
*Staff Contact:* Esmeralda Jardines – (415) 575-9144  
[esmeralda.jardines@sfgov.org](mailto:esmeralda.jardines@sfgov.org)

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 AMENDMENT THAT WOULD REZONE THE SUBJECT PROPERTY FROM RED (RESIDENTIAL ENCLAVE) TO RED-MX (RESIDENTIAL ENCLAVE-MIXED) ZONING DISTRICT AND ADOPTING ENVIRONMENTAL FINDINGS AND FINDINGS OF CONSISTENCY WITH THE PRIORITY POLICIES OF PLANNING CODE SECTION 101.1 AND THE GENERAL PLAN.**

WHEREAS, on September 27, 2016, John Kevlin of Rueben, Junius & Rose, on behalf of Michael Hansen & Jo-Ann Hansen, Judith Long (Property Owner), filed an application with the San Francisco Planning Department for a Zoning Map Amendment, as detailed in Case Number 2016-012474MAP; and

WHEREAS, the Zoning Map Amendment would amend San Francisco Zoning Map Sheet No. ZN07 to rezone Block 3516, Lot Nos: 039 (118-120 Kissling Street), 040 (124 Kissling Street), 041 (130 Kissling Street), and 042 (134 Kissling Street) from RED (Residential Enclave) to RED-MX (Residential Enclave-Mixed) Zoning District; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission (hereinafter "Commission") conducted a duly noticed public hearing to consider the initiation of the proposed Ordinance on October 19, 2017; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Department has determined the proposed Planning Code amendment is subject to a Categorical Exemption from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) pursuant to Section 15060(c)2 of the Guidelines for Implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act for activities that will not result in a direct or reasonably foreseeable indirect physical change in the environment; and,

WHEREAS, on March 2, 2016, the proposed project was determined to be exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) under CEQA State Guidelines 15311, or Class 11. On October 20, 2016 the Project Sponsor proposed a modification to the approved project. On August 8, 2017, in accordance

with Chapter 31 of the Administrative Code, the Planning Department determined the modification of the CEQA exempt project did not constitute a substantial modification of the 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 Department staff and other interested parties; and

WHEREAS, the 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

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission finds from the facts presented that the public necessity, convenience, and general welfare require the proposed amendment; and

MOVED, that the Planning Commission hereby **approves** the proposed ordinance.

## **FINDINGS**

Having reviewed the materials identified in the preamble above, and having heard all testimony and arguments, this Commission finds, concludes, and determines as follows:

1. **General Plan Compliance.** The proposed Ordinance and the Commission's recommended modifications are *consistent* with the following Objectives and Policies of the General Plan:

## **COMMERCE AND INDUSTRY ELEMENT**

### **Objectives and Policies**

#### **OBJECTIVE 2:**

**MAINTAIN AND ENHANCE A SOUND AND DIVERSE ECONOMIC BASE AND FISCAL STRUCTURE FOR THE CITY.**

#### **Policy 2.1**

Seek to retain existing commercial and industrial activity and do attract new such activity to the City.

*The proposed amendment would permit a PDR business to retain the existing automotive repair use (DBA Royal Motors) which occupies an approximately 62,000 sq. ft. site by allowing an expansion that would provide additional vehicle storage and service capacity to better ensure its long term viability at the subject site. The additional vehicle storage capacity will allow Royal Motors to deliver cars to dealerships and owners more rapidly than currently possible. Thus, an industrial business will be allowed to expand and remain in San Francisco. Currently, the RED (Residential Enclave) Zoning District does not permit an enclosed lot for vehicle storage. However, this land use is conditionally permitted in the RED-MX (Residential Enclave-Mixed) Zoning District. Without the rezoning, this use would not be permitted and the existing industrial business would not be permitted to grow in capacity.*

#### **OBJECTIVE 3**

**PROVIDE EXPANDED EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES FOR CITY RESIDENTS, PARTICULARLY THE UNDEREMPLOYED AND ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED.**

**Policy 3.1**

Promote the attraction, retention, and expansion of commercial and industrial firms, which provide employment improvement opportunities for unskilled and semi-skilled workers.

**OBJECTIVE 4:**

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

**Policy 4.3**

Carefully consider public actions that displace existing viable industrial firms.

**Policy 4.4**

When displacement does occur, attempt to relocate desired firms within the city.

**Policy 4.6**

Assist in the provision of available land for site expansion.

**Policy 4.10**

Enhance the working environment within the industrial areas.

*The proposed amendment promotes the attraction, retention, and expansion of the existing automotive repair use by enhancing its operational capacity and thereby, providing the potential for expanded employment opportunities. The existing automotive repair facility provides on-going job opportunities to mechanics and to trade-skilled workers.*

**URBAN DESIGN ELEMENT**

**Objectives and Policies**

**OBJECTIVE 1:**

**EMPHASIS OF THE CHARACTERISTIC PATTERN, WHICH GIVES TO THE CITY AND ITS NEIGHBORHOODS AN IMAGE, A SENSE OF PURPOSE, AND A MEANS OF ORIENTATION.**

**Policy 1.3**

Recognize that buildings, when seen together, produce a total effect that characterizes the city and its districts.

**Policy 1.7**

Recognize the natural boundaries of districts, and promote connections between districts.

**WESTERN SOMA AREA PLAN**

**LAND USE**

## **OBJECTIVE 1.2**

**ENCOURAGE PRESERVATION OF EXISTING AND VIABLY APPROPRIATE NEW LAND USES IN LOCATIONS THAT PROVIDE THE GREATEST OPPORTUNITIES FOR SUCCESS AND MINIMIZE CONFLICT WITH RESIDENTIAL USES.**

*The amendment permits the preservation of the existing automotive repair use (DBA Royal Motors) by providing additional vehicle storage that will enhance the existing operational capacity. The proposed enhancements (see case no. 2016-012474CUA), complement the existing automotive repair facility use and will better ensure the long-term viability of the facility at the site.*

## **NEIGHBORHOOD ECONOMY**

### **OBJECTIVE 2.1**

**RETAIN AND ENCOURAGE GROWTH OPPORTUNITIES FOR EXISTING BUSINESSES.**

#### **Policy 2.1.1**

Promote a wide range of neighborhood-serving commercial uses north of Harrison Street.

*The amendment promotes the retention and growth of the existing automotive repair business by legalizing the expansion of the site's capacity for vehicle service and storage while not disrupting any existing buildings, currently not permitted in the RED but conditionally permitted in the RED-MX. The existing use is one of the few remaining large-scale automotive repair facilities within the neighborhood. The amendment would allow the facility to legally continue servicing vehicles, storing them on-site, and continue washing vehicles as they are prepared for delivery either to showrooms or to their owners. The rezoning would thus permit Planning Code compliance.*

## **URBAN DESIGN AND BUILT FORM**

### **OBJECTIVE 5.1**

**REINFORCE THE DIVERSITY OF THE EXISTING BUILT FORM AND THE WAREHOUSE, INDUSTRIAL AND ALLEY CHARACTER.**

#### **Policy 2.1.1**

Develop design standards that preserve the industrial character of the larger streets, the mixed industrial/residential character of the RED-Mixed areas, and the residential character of the REDs.

*The proposed amendment would change the zoning from RED to RED-MX. Nevertheless, the architectural screen wall that is proposed per case no. 2016-012474CUA, is well-integrated with the existing architecture and compatible with the mixed-use, light-industrial character of the surrounding neighborhood context. The screen wall maintains a well-defined street wall with a color and height that matches the existing building while the three-dimensional form contributes to the visual diversity of the use. The materiality of the proposed screen wall is metal which is consistent with many of the light-industrial buildings found in the surrounding neighborhood. The Project will improve the streetscape by providing a permeable landscape buffer between the proposed screen wall and the public right-of-way. Accent lighting will further soften and accentuate the landscaping and screen wall at night, which will better*



*activate the street frontages and relate to the residential character also found within the surrounding neighborhood. Thus, the Urban Design objectives and policies would still apply to both RED to RED-MX.*

**OBJECTIVE 10.4**

**ENSURE A HIGH QUALITY OF LIFE FOR EXISTING AND NEW RESIDENTS AND WORKERS.**

**Policy 10.4.1**

Significantly enhance pedestrian safety throughout Western SoMa.

*The proposed amendment would permit the Project site to enhance pedestrian safety around the site by eliminating an existing 46-ft 6-in. curb cut along Kissling Street by expanding a vehicle storage facility in the RED-MX. Vehicular access to vehicle storage will be limited to one point along Kissling Street; instead of the current three access points. In addition, the Howard Street curb cut will continue to be used to access the existing car wash facility; thereby, reducing the amount of vehicles accessing the site.*

*On balance, the Project is consistent with the Objectives and Policies of the General Plan.*

2. **Planning Code Section 101.1(b)** establishes eight priority-planning policies. The proposed amendments to the Planning Code are consistent with the eight Priority Policies set forth in Section 101.1(b) of the Planning Code in that:

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

*The proposed amendment would not affect neighborhood-serving retail uses because the project site does not possess any. Thus, no existing neighborhood-serving uses would be displaced or otherwise adversely affected by the proposal.*

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

*The proposed amendment would not affect existing housing and neighborhood character. Residential uses are permitted in both the RED and RED-MX. Thus, if the proposed vehicle storage stacker use were to change to residential, the aforementioned would still be permitted in a RED-MX.*

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

*The proposed amendment would not affect supply of housing. Residential uses are permitted in both the RED and RED-MX; therefore, inclusionary housing would be required in both zoning districts accordingly. Thus, if the proposed vehicle storage stacker use were to change to residential, the aforementioned would still be required pursuant to Planning Code Section 415 in a RED-MX.*

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

*The proposed amendment would not impede MUNI transit service or adversely impact street circulation or parking.*

5. That a diverse economic base be maintained by protecting our industrial and service sectors from displacement due to commercial office development, and that future opportunities for resident employment and ownership in these sectors be enhanced;

*The amendment would permit an existing PDR use to expand and remain in San Francisco; thus, bolstering the industrial sector, which is a priority for the City. The Project incorporates an expanded PDR use which assists in further diversifying the neighborhood character and the RED-MX Zoning District.*

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

*While the proposed amendment would not modify any physical parameters of the Planning Code or other Codes, the proposal could improve the effectiveness of an existing PDR business facilities as it pursues upgrades to its site. Therefore, the proposed amendment would promote the greatest possible preparedness to protect against injury and loss of life in an earthquake.*

7. That the landmarks and historic buildings be preserved;

*The proposed amendment would not impact any City Landmarks or historic buildings. The Department finds that the amendment is consistent with the historic industrial character of the surrounding eligible historic district (Western SoMa Light Industrial and Residential Historic District).*

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

*The proposed amendment would not adversely affect any nearby open space.*

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Commission hereby recommends that the Board ADOPT the proposed Ordinance as described in this Resolution and in the proposed Ordinance with the modification to increase the administrative penalty fee as assessed by the Zoning Administrator per amended Planning Code Section 176 from up to \$200.00 a day to up to \$250.00 a day.

**Protest of Fee or Exaction:** You may protest any fee or exaction subject to Government Code Section 66000 that is imposed as a condition of approval by following the procedures set forth in Government Code Section 66020. The protest must satisfy the requirements of Government Code Section 66020(a) and must be filed within 90 days of the date of the first approval or conditional approval of the development referencing the challenged fee or exaction. For purposes of Government Code Section 66020, the date of imposition of the fee shall be the date of the earliest discretionary approval by the City of the subject development.

If the City has not previously given Notice of an earlier discretionary approval of the project, the Planning Commission's adoption of this Motion, Resolution, Discretionary Review Action or the Zoning Administrator's Variance Decision Letter constitutes the approval or conditional approval of the development and the City hereby gives **NOTICE** that the 90-day protest period under Government Code Section 66020 has begun. If the City has already given Notice that the 90-day approval period has begun for the subject development, then this document does not re-commence the 90-day approval period.

I hereby certify that the foregoing Resolution was adopted by the Commission at its meeting on October 25, 2018.

Jonas P. Ionin  
Commission Secretary


AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

ADOPTED:     October 25, 2018

# Parcel Map




SUBJECT PROPERTY



Conditional Use Authorization  
 Case No. 2016-012474MAP  
 118-134 Kissling Street

# Sanborn Map\*



\*The Sanborn Maps in San Francisco have not been updated since 1998, and this map may not accurately reflect existing conditions.


**SUBJECT PROPERTY**



Conditional Use Authorization  
Case No. 2016-012474MAP  
118-134 Kissling Street



# Zoning Map




**SUBJECT PROPERTY**



Conditional Use Authorization  
Case No. 2016-012474MAP  
118-134 Kissling Street



# Height & Bulk Map





SUBJECT PROPERTY



Conditional Use Authorization  
Case No. 2016-012474MAP  
118-134 Kissling Street



# Aerial Photographs of 118-134 Kissling Street




**PROJECT SITE**

Conditional Use Authorization  
Case No. 2016-012474MAP  
118-134 Kissling Street



# Site Photographs of 118-134 Kissling Street



**PROJECT SITE**

Conditional Use Authorization  
Case No. 2016-012474MAP  
118-134 Kissling Street

# Ordinance Amending the Planning Code by revising Zoning Map Sheet No. ZN07

Conditional Use Authorization

Case No. 2016-012474MAP

118-134 Kissling Street

1 [Zoning Map – Rezoning of 118-134 Kissling Street]

2  
3 **Ordinance amending the Planning Code by revising Zoning Map Sheet No. ZN07 to**  
4 **rezone Assessor’s Block No. 3516, Lot Nos. 039, 040, 041, & 042 (118-134 Kissling**  
5 **Street) from Residential Enclave District to Residential Enclave District – Mixed;**  
6 **affirming the Planning Department’s determination under the California Environmental**  
7 **Quality Act; making findings of public necessity, convenience, and welfare under**  
8 **Planning Code, Section 302; and making findings of consistency with the General Plan,**  
9 **and the eight priority policies of Planning Code, Section 101.1.**

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

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

18 Section 1. Findings.

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

24 (b) Pursuant to Planning Code Section 302, this Board finds that the actions  
25 contemplated in this ordinance will serve the public necessity, convenience, and welfare for  
the reasons set forth in Planning Commission Resolution No. \_\_\_\_ and the Board

1 incorporates such reasons herein by reference. A copy of the Planning Commission  
2 Resolution No. \_\_\_\_ is on file with the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors in File No. \_\_\_\_\_.

3 (c) This Board finds that the actions contemplated in this ordinance are consistent  
4 with the General Plan and with the Priority Policies of Planning Code Section 101.1 for the  
5 reasons set forth in Planning Commission Resolution No. \_\_\_\_\_ and the Board hereby  
6 incorporates such reasons herein by reference.


7  
8 Section 2. The Planning Code is hereby amended by revising Sheet ZN07 of the Zoning  
9 Map of the City and County of San Francisco, as follows:

	<u>Use District</u>	<u>Use District</u>
<u>Description of Property</u>	<u>to be Superseded</u>	<u>Hereby Approved</u>
13 Block 3516, Lots 039, 14 040, 041, & 042	RED	RED-MX

15  
16 Section 3. Effective Date. This ordinance shall become effective 30 days after  
17 enactment. Enactment occurs when the Mayor signs the ordinance, the Mayor returns the  
18 ordinance unsigned or does not sign the ordinance within ten days of receiving it, or the Board  
19 of Supervisors overrides the Mayor's veto of the ordinance.

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

22  
23 By:

  
KATE H. STACY  
Deputy City Attorney

24  
25 n:\land\as2017\9690392\01226615.docx



# Environmental Determination:CEQA Categorical Exemption



# SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

## CEQA Categorical Exemption Determination

### PROPERTY INFORMATION/PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Project Address		Block/Lot(s)	
Case No.	Permit No.	Plans Dated	
<input type="checkbox"/> Addition/ Alteration	<input type="checkbox"/> Demolition (requires HRER if over 45 years old)	<input type="checkbox"/> New Construction	<input type="checkbox"/> Project Modification <b>(GO TO STEP 7)</b>
Project description for Planning Department approval.			

### STEP 1: EXEMPTION CLASS

TO BE COMPLETED BY PROJECT PLANNER

<b>Note: If neither Class 1 or 3 applies, an <i>Environmental Evaluation Application</i> is required.</b>	
	<b>Class 1 – Existing Facilities.</b> Interior and exterior alterations; additions under 10,000 sq. ft.
	<b>Class 3 – New Construction/ Conversion of Small Structures.</b> Up to three (3) new single-family residences or six (6) dwelling units in one building; commercial/office structures; utility extensions; change of use under 10,000 sq. ft. if principally permitted or with a CU.
	Class__

### STEP 2: CEQA IMPACTS

TO BE COMPLETED BY PROJECT PLANNER

<b>If any box is checked below, an <i>Environmental Evaluation Application</i> is required.</b>	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Air Quality:</b> Would the project add new sensitive receptors (specifically, schools, day care facilities, hospitals, residential dwellings, and senior-care facilities) within an Air Pollution Exposure Zone? Does the project have the potential to emit substantial pollutant concentrations (e.g., backup diesel generators, heavy industry, diesel trucks)? <i>Exceptions: do not check box if the applicant presents documentation of enrollment in the San Francisco Department of Public Health (DPH) Article 38 program and the project would not have the potential to emit substantial pollutant concentrations. (refer to EP_ArcMap &gt; CEQA Catex Determination Layers &gt; Air Pollutant Exposure Zone)</i>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Hazardous Materials:</b> If the project site is located on the Maher map or is suspected of containing hazardous materials (based on a previous use such as gas station, auto repair, dry cleaners, or heavy manufacturing, or a site with underground storage tanks): Would the project involve 50 cubic yards or more of soil disturbance - or a change of use from industrial to residential? If yes, this box must be checked and the project applicant must submit an Environmental Application with a Phase I

	Environmental Site Assessment. <i>Exceptions: do not check box if the applicant presents documentation of enrollment in the San Francisco Department of Public Health (DPH) Maher program, a DPH waiver from the Maher program, or other documentation from Environmental Planning staff that hazardous material effects would be less than significant (refer to EP_ArcMap &gt; Maher layer).</i>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Transportation:</b> Does the project create six (6) or more net new parking spaces or residential units? Does the project have the potential to adversely affect transit, pedestrian and/or bicycle safety (hazards) or the adequacy of nearby transit, pedestrian and/or bicycle facilities?
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Archeological Resources:</b> Would the project result in soil disturbance/modification greater than two (2) feet below grade in an archeological sensitive area or eight (8) feet in a non-archeological sensitive area? <i>(refer to EP_ArcMap &gt; CEQA Catex Determination Layers &gt; Archeological Sensitive Area)</i>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Noise:</b> Does the project include new noise-sensitive receptors (schools, day care facilities, hospitals, residential dwellings, and senior-care facilities) fronting roadways located in the noise mitigation area? <i>(refer to EP_ArcMap &gt; CEQA Catex Determination Layers &gt; Noise Mitigation Area)</i>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Subdivision/Lot Line Adjustment:</b> Does the project site involve a subdivision or lot line adjustment on a lot with a slope average of 20% or more? <i>(refer to EP_ArcMap &gt; CEQA Catex Determination Layers &gt; Topography)</i>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Slope = or &gt; 20%:</b> Does the project involve excavation of 50 cubic yards of soil or more, new construction, or square footage expansion greater than 1,000 sq. ft. outside of the existing building footprint? <i>(refer to EP_ArcMap &gt; CEQA Catex Determination Layers &gt; Topography)</i> <b>If box is checked, a geotechnical report is required.</b>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Seismic: Landslide Zone:</b> Does the project involve excavation of 50 cubic yards of soil or more, new construction, or square footage expansion greater than 1,000 sq. ft. outside of the existing building footprint? <i>(refer to EP_ArcMap &gt; CEQA Catex Determination Layers &gt; Seismic Hazard Zones)</i> <b>If box is checked, a geotechnical report is required.</b>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Seismic: Liquefaction Zone:</b> Does the project involve excavation of 50 cubic yards of soil or more, new construction, or square footage expansion greater than 1,000 sq. ft. outside of the existing building footprint? <i>(refer to EP_ArcMap &gt; CEQA Catex Determination Layers &gt; Seismic Hazard Zones)</i> <b>If box is checked, a geotechnical report will likely be required.</b>
<b>If no boxes are checked above, GO TO STEP 3. <u>If one or more boxes are checked above, an <i>Environmental Evaluation Application</i> is required, unless reviewed by an Environmental Planner.</u></b>	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Project can proceed with categorical exemption review. The project does not trigger any of the CEQA impacts listed above.</b>
<b>Comments and Planner Signature (optional):</b>	

**STEP 3: PROPERTY STATUS – HISTORIC RESOURCE  
TO BE COMPLETED BY PROJECT PLANNER**

<b>PROPERTY IS ONE OF THE FOLLOWING:</b> <i>(refer to Parcel Information Map)</i>	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Category A:</b> Known Historical Resource. <b>GO TO STEP 5.</b>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Category B:</b> Potential Historical Resource (over 45 years of age). <b>GO TO STEP 4.</b>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Category C:</b> Not a Historical Resource or Not Age Eligible (under 45 years of age). <b>GO TO STEP 6.</b>

**STEP 4: PROPOSED WORK CHECKLIST  
TO BE COMPLETED BY PROJECT PLANNER**

<b>Check all that apply to the project.</b>	
<input type="checkbox"/>	1. <b>Change of use and new construction.</b> Tenant improvements not included.
<input type="checkbox"/>	2. <b>Regular maintenance or repair</b> to correct or repair deterioration, decay, or damage to building.
<input type="checkbox"/>	3. <b>Window replacement</b> that meets the Department's <i>Window Replacement Standards</i> . Does not include storefront window alterations.
<input type="checkbox"/>	4. <b>Garage work.</b> A new opening that meets the <i>Guidelines for Adding Garages and Curb Cuts</i> , and/or replacement of a garage door in an existing opening that meets the Residential Design Guidelines.
<input type="checkbox"/>	5. <b>Deck, terrace construction, or fences</b> not visible from any immediately adjacent public right-of-way.
<input type="checkbox"/>	6. <b>Mechanical equipment installation</b> that is not visible from any immediately adjacent public right-of-way.
<input type="checkbox"/>	7. <b>Dormer installation</b> that meets the requirements for exemption from public notification under <i>Zoning Administrator Bulletin No. 3: Dormer Windows</i> .
<input type="checkbox"/>	8. <b>Addition(s)</b> that are not visible from any immediately adjacent public right-of-way for 150 feet in each direction; does not extend vertically beyond the floor level of the top story of the structure or is only a single story in height; does not have a footprint that is more than 50% larger than that of the original building; and does not cause the removal of architectural significant roofing features.
<b>Note: Project Planner must check box below before proceeding.</b>	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Project is not listed. <b>GO TO STEP 5.</b>
<input type="checkbox"/>	Project <b>does not conform</b> to the scopes of work. <b>GO TO STEP 5.</b>
<input type="checkbox"/>	Project involves <b>four or more</b> work descriptions. <b>GO TO STEP 5.</b>
<input type="checkbox"/>	Project involves <b>less than four</b> work descriptions. <b>GO TO STEP 6.</b>

**STEP 5: CEQA IMPACTS – ADVANCED HISTORICAL REVIEW  
TO BE COMPLETED BY PRESERVATION PLANNER**

<b>Check all that apply to the project.</b>	
<input type="checkbox"/>	1. Project involves a <b>known historical resource (CEQA Category A)</b> as determined by Step 3 and conforms entirely to proposed work checklist in Step 4.
<input type="checkbox"/>	2. <b>Interior alterations to publicly accessible spaces.</b>
<input type="checkbox"/>	3. <b>Window replacement</b> of original/historic windows that are not “in-kind” but are consistent with existing historic character.
<input type="checkbox"/>	4. <b>Façade/storefront alterations</b> that do not remove, alter, or obscure character-defining features.
<input type="checkbox"/>	5. <b>Raising the building</b> in a manner that does not remove, alter, or obscure character-defining features.
<input type="checkbox"/>	6. <b>Restoration</b> based upon documented evidence of a building’s historic condition, such as historic photographs, plans, physical evidence, or similar buildings.
<input type="checkbox"/>	7. <b>Addition(s)</b> , including mechanical equipment that are minimally visible from a public right-of-way and meet the <i>Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation</i> .

<input type="checkbox"/>	8. <b>Other work consistent</b> with the <i>Secretary of the Interior Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties</i> (specify or add comments):
<input type="checkbox"/>	9. <b>Other work</b> that would not materially impair a historic district (specify or add comments):  (Requires approval by Senior Preservation Planner/Preservation Coordinator) _____
<input type="checkbox"/>	10. <b>Reclassification of property status</b> to Category C. (Requires approval by Senior Preservation Planner/Preservation Coordinator) a. Per HRER dated: _____ (attach HRER) b. Other (specify):
<b>Note: If ANY box in STEP 5 above is checked, a Preservation Planner MUST check one box below.</b>	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Further environmental review required.</b> Based on the information provided, the project requires an <i>Environmental Evaluation Application</i> to be submitted. <b>GO TO STEP 6.</b>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Project can proceed with categorical exemption review.</b> The project has been reviewed by the Preservation Planner and can proceed with categorical exemption review. <b>GO TO STEP 6.</b>
<b>Comments (optional):</b>	
<b>Preservation Planner Signature:</b>	

**STEP 6: CATEGORICAL EXEMPTION DETERMINATION**

**TO BE COMPLETED BY PROJECT PLANNER**

<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Further environmental review required.</b> Proposed project does not meet scopes of work in either (check all that apply): <input type="checkbox"/> Step 2 – CEQA Impacts <input type="checkbox"/> Step 5 – Advanced Historical Review <b>STOP! Must file an <i>Environmental Evaluation Application</i>.</b>	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>No further environmental review is required. The project is categorically exempt under CEQA.</b>	
	<b>Planner Name:</b>	<b>Signature:</b>
	<b>Project Approval Action:</b>  If Discretionary Review before the Planning Commission is requested, the Discretionary Review hearing is the Approval Action for the project.	
Once signed or stamped and dated, this document constitutes a categorical exemption pursuant to CEQA Guidelines and Chapter 31 of the Administrative Code. In accordance with Chapter 31 of the San Francisco Administrative Code, an appeal of an exemption determination can only be filed within 30 days of the project receiving the first approval action.		

**STEP 7: MODIFICATION OF A CEQA EXEMPT PROJECT  
TO BE COMPLETED BY PROJECT PLANNER**

In accordance with Chapter 31 of the San Francisco Administrative Code, when a California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) exempt project changes after the Approval Action and requires a subsequent approval, the Environmental Review Officer (or his or her designee) must determine whether the proposed change constitutes a substantial modification of that project. This checklist shall be used to determine whether the proposed changes to the approved project would constitute a “substantial modification” and, therefore, be subject to additional environmental review pursuant to CEQA.

**PROPERTY INFORMATION/PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

Project Address (If different than front page)		Block/Lot(s) (If different than front page)
Case No.	Previous Building Permit No.	New Building Permit No.
Plans Dated	Previous Approval Action	New Approval Action
Modified Project Description:		

**DETERMINATION IF PROJECT CONSTITUTES SUBSTANTIAL MODIFICATION**

Compared to the approved project, would the modified project:	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Result in expansion of the building envelope, as defined in the Planning Code;
<input type="checkbox"/>	Result in the change of use that would require public notice under Planning Code Sections 311 or 312;
<input type="checkbox"/>	Result in demolition as defined under Planning Code Section 317 or 19005(f)?
<input type="checkbox"/>	Is any information being presented that was not known and could not have been known at the time of the original determination, that shows the originally approved project may no longer qualify for the exemption?
<b>If at least one of the above boxes is checked, further environmental review is required.</b>	

**DETERMINATION OF NO SUBSTANTIAL MODIFICATION**

<input type="checkbox"/>	The proposed modification would not result in any of the above changes.
If this box is checked, the proposed modifications are categorically exempt under CEQA, in accordance with prior project approval and no additional environmental review is required. This determination shall be posted on the Planning Department website and office and mailed to the applicant, City approving entities, and anyone requesting written notice.	
<b>Planner Name:</b>	<b>Signature or Stamp:</b>



# Public Comment

## Jardines, Esmeralda (CPC)

---

**From:** Marvis Phillips <marvisphillips@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, October 12, 2018 1:11 AM  
**To:** Jardines, Esmeralda (CPC)  
**Cc:** JKevlin  
**Subject:** 2016-012474CUA/MAP

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Esmeralda,

The District 6 Community Planners is in support of the "Stackers" for the automotive repair facility, at 118-134 Kissling Street in the Western SOMA SUD/RED (proposed RED-MX) District. We are also in support of creating the RED-MX District. We need to support our small businesses because they are the largest employer in San Francisco, and the backbone of our communities. This is a fine example of what is good about the city, this area, and this industry. We encouraged the Planning Commission to support small businesses and pass these issues.

Sincerely,

Marvis J. Phillips  
Board Chair  
District 6 Community Planners

--

Marvis J. Phillips  
Board Chair  
District 6 Community Planners



# SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

---

## Planning Commission Resolution No. 20031 Initiation of Zoning Map Amendment HEARING DATE: OCTOBER 19, 2017

*Project Name:* 118-134 Kissling Street  
*Case Number:* 2016-012474MAP  
*Initiated by:* John Kevlin, Reuben, Junius & Rose  
One Bush Street, Ste. 600  
San Francisco, CA 94104  
*Staff Contact:* Esmeralda Jardines, Planner  
esmeralda.jardines@sfgov.org, 415-575-9144

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

Reception:  
**415.558.6378**

Fax:  
**415.558.6409**

Planning  
Information:  
**415.558.6377**

INITIATING ZONING MAP AMENDMENT TO SAN FRANCISCO ZONING MAP SHEET NO. ZN07 TO REZONE BLOCK NO. 3516 AND LOT NOS. 039 (118-120 KISSLING STREET), 040 (124 KISSLING STREET), 041 (130 KISSLING STREET), AND 042 (134 KISSLING STREET) FROM RED (RESIDENTIAL ENCLAVE) TO RED-MX (RESIDENTIAL ENCLAVE-MIXED) ZONING DISTRICT.

### PREAMBLE

WHEREAS, on September 27, 2016, John Kevlin of Rueben, Junius & Rose, on behalf of Michael Hansen & Jo-Ann Hansen, Judith Long (Property Owner), filed an application with the San Francisco Planning Department for a Zoning Map Amendment, as detailed in Case Number 2016-012474MAP; and

WHEREAS, the Zoning Map Amendment would amend San Francisco Zoning Map Sheet No. ZN07 to rezone Block 3516, Lot Nos: 039 (118-120 Kissling Street), 040 (124 Kissling Street), 041 (130 Kissling Street), and 042 (134 Kissling Street) from RED (Residential Enclave) to RED-MX (Residential Enclave-Mixed) Zoning District; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission (hereinafter "Commission") conducted a duly noticed public hearing to consider the initiation of the proposed Ordinance on October 19, 2017; and

WHEREAS, on March 2, 2016, the proposed project was determined to be exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) under CEQA State Guidelines 15311, or Class 11. On October 20, 2016 the Project Sponsor proposed a modification to the approved project. On August 8, 2017, in accordance with Chapter 31 of the Administrative Code, the Planning Department determined the modification of the CEQA exempt project did not constitute a substantial modification of the 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 Department staff and other interested parties; and

WHEREAS, the 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:

**MOVED**, that pursuant to Planning Code Section 302(b), the Planning Commission Adopts a Resolution of Intent to Initiate amendments to the Planning Code.

**AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED**, that pursuant to Planning Code Section 306.3, the Planning Commission authorizes the Department to provide appropriate notice for a public hearing to consider the above referenced Zoning Map Amendment contained in the Case No. 2016-012474MAP, approved as to form by the City Attorney in **Exhibit A**, to be considered at a publicly noticed hearing on or after November 8, 2017.

I hereby certify that the foregoing Resolution was **ADOPTED** by the San Francisco Planning Commission on October 19, 2017.



Jonas P. Ionin  
Commission Secretary

- AYES: Fong, Johnson, Koppel, Melgar, and Richards  
NOES: None  
ABSENT: Hillis, Moore  
ADOPTED: October 19, 2017



# SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

---

March 2, 2020

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

**Re: Transmittal of Planning Department Case Number 2016-012474MAP:  
118-134 Kissling Street  
Board File No. TBD  
Planning Commission Recommendation: Approval**

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisor Haney,

On October 25, 2018, the Planning Commission conducted a duly noticed public hearing at a regularly scheduled meeting to consider the proposed Zoning Map Amendment of San Francisco Map Sheet No. ZN07, initiated by a member of the public, to rezone Block No 3516 and Lot Nos. 039 (118-120 Kissling Street), 040 (124 Kissling Street), 041 (130 Kissling Street), 042 (134 Kissling Street) from RED (Residential Enclave) to RED-MX (Residential Enclave-Mixed) Zoning District, per Planning Commission Motion No. 20328. At the hearing the Planning Commission recommended approval.

Supervisor Haney, if you would like to take sponsorship of the proposed Ordinance please contact the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors at your earliest convenience.

Please find attached documents relating to the actions of the Commission. The original, signed, redlined version of the ordinance, along with two photocopies will be delivered to the Clerk's office following this transmittal. 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 "Aaron D. Starr".

Aaron D. Starr  
Manager of Legislative Affairs

cc:

Kate H. Stacy, Deputy City Attorney

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

Reception:  
**415.558.6378**

Fax:  
**415.558.6409**

Planning  
Information:  
**415.558.6377**

Abi RivamonteMesa, Aide to Supervisor Haney  
Erica Major, Office of the Clerk of the Board

Attachments :

Planning Commission Resolution  
Planning Department Executive Summary



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

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

**Date:** March 1, 2021

**Time:** 1:30 p.m.

**Location:** REMOTE MEETING VIA VIDEOCONFERENCE

**Watch:** [www.sfgovtv.org](http://www.sfgovtv.org)

**Watch:** SF Cable Channel 26, 78 or 99 (*depending on provider*)

**Public Comment Call-In:** <https://sfbos.org/remote-meeting-call>

**Subject:** **File No. 200660.** Ordinance amending the Planning Code by revising Zoning Map Sheet No. ZN07 to rezone Assessor's Parcel Block No. 3516, Lot Nos. 039, 040, 041, and 042 (118-134 Kissling Street), from Residential Enclave District to Residential Enclave District - Mixed; affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act; making findings of public necessity, convenience, and welfare under Planning Code, Section 302; and making findings of consistency with the General Plan, and the eight priority policies of Planning Code, Section 101.1.

On March 17, 2020, the Board of Supervisors authorized their Board and Committee meetings to convene remotely and allow for remote public comment due to the Coronavirus -19 pandemic. Therefore, Board of Supervisors meetings that are held through videoconferencing will allow remote public comment. Visit the SFGovTV website ([www.sfgovtv.org](http://www.sfgovtv.org)) to stream the live meetings or watch them on demand.

Please visit the Board's website (<https://sfbos.org/city-board-response-covid-19>) regularly to be updated on the City's response to COVID-19 and how the legislative process may be impacted.

**PUBLIC COMMENT CALL-IN**

**WATCH:** SF Cable Channel 26, 78 or 99 (*depending on your provider*) once the meeting starts, and the telephone number and access code will be displayed on the screen; or


**VISIT:** <https://sfbos.org/remote-meeting-call>

In accordance with Administrative Code, Section 67.7-1, persons who are unable to attend the hearing on this matter may submit written comments prior to the time the hearing begins. The comments will be made as part of the official public record in this matter and shall be brought to the attention of the Board of Supervisors. Written comments should be addressed to Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board, City Hall, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244, San Francisco, CA, 94102 or sent via email ([board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org](mailto:board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org)). Information relating to this matter is available in the Office of the Clerk of the Board or the Board of Supervisors' Legislative Research Center (<https://sfbos.org/legislative-research-center-lrc>). Agenda information relating to this matter will be available for public review on Friday, February 26, 2021.

For any questions about this hearing, please contact Erica Major, the Clerk of the Land Use and Transportation Committee:

Erica Major ([Erica.Major@sfgov.org](mailto:Erica.Major@sfgov.org)) ~ (415) 554-4441)

***Please Note:*** *The Department is open for business, but employees are working from home. Please allow 48 hours for us to return your call or email.*



Angela Calvillo  
Clerk of the Board of Supervisors  
City and County of San Francisco

em:bjj:ams