| 1  | [Conditionally Reversing the Exemption Determination - 1151 Washington Street]                   |
|----|--|
| 2  |  |
| 3  | Motion conditionally reversing the determination by the Planning Department that the             |
| 4  | proposed project at 1151 Washington Street is exempt from environmental review,                  |
| 5  | subject to the adoption of written findings of the Board in support of this                      |
| 6  | determination.   |
| 7  |  |
| 8  | WHEREAS, On April 7, 2023, the Planning Department issued a CEQA Categorical                     |
| 9  | Exemption Determination for the proposed project located at 1151 Washington Street               |
| 10 | ("Project") under the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA"), the CEQA Guidelines,        |
| 11 | and San Francisco Administrative Code, Chapter 31; and   |
| 12 | WHEREAS, The project site is a 3,571-square-foot parcel in the Nob Hill neighborhood,            |
| 13 | occupied by an existing 30-foot-tall, three-story, single-family residence that is approximately |
| 14 | 3,050 square feet in size with two off-street parking spaces; and                                |
| 15 | WHEREAS, The project sponsor proposes the demolition of the existing single-family               |
| 16 | residence and construction of a 40-foot-tall (50-foot-tall with penthouses), four-story over     |
| 17 | basement residential building containing 10 for-sale townhouses and one off-street van           |
| 18 | parking space; access to the proposed units would be from a 5-foot-wide pathway that would       |
| 19 | step up along the eastern edge of the property, from Washington Street; the proposed             |
| 20 | pathway would include a bicycle ramp; the proposed building would be approximately 12,300        |
| 21 | square feet in size, and would utilize the state density bonus program; and                      |
| 22 | WHEREAS, On November 1, 2022, Dana Manea (representing the project sponsor)                      |
| 23 | filed a project application with the department for the project; and                             |
| 24 | WHEREAS, Pursuant to Article 19 of the CEQA Guidelines (California Code of                       |
| 25 | Regulations, Title 14, Division 6, Chapter 3, Article 19, Sections 15300-15333), on April 7,     |

| 1  | 2023, the department determined that the project was categorically exempt under CEQA            |
|----|---|
| 2  | Class 32 - Infill Development ("exemption determination"), and that no environmental review     |
| 3  | was required; and   |
| 4  | WHEREAS, On April 20, 2023, the Planning Commission ("Commission") conducted a                  |
| 5  | duly noticed public hearing at a regularly scheduled commission meeting and approved the        |
| 6  | Conditional Use Authorization for the proposed project; and                                     |
| 7  | WHEREAS, On May 17, 2023, Richard Drury of Lozeau Drury, LLP, on behalf of                      |
| 8  | Clayton Timbrell ("Appellant"), filed an appeal of the categorical exemption determination; and |
| 9  | WHEREAS, On May 19, 2023, Hanmin Liu, on behalf of the Upper Chinatown                          |
| 10 | Neighborhood Association (UCNA), filed a memorandum indicating that UCNA is joining the         |
| 11 | appeal of the exemption determination filed by Richard Drury (on May 17, 2023), and noting      |
| 12 | that UCNA is not raising any new issues or enlarging the scope of the appeal; and               |
| 13 | WHEREAS, By memorandum to the Clerk of the Board dated May 22, 2023, the                        |
| 14 | department determined that the appeal was timely filed; and                                     |
| 15 | WHEREAS, On June 27, 2023, this Board held a duly noticed public hearing to                     |
| 16 | consider the appeal of the exemption determination filed by Appellant; and                      |
| 17 | WHEREAS, In reviewing the appeal of the exemption determination, this Board                     |
| 18 | reviewed and considered the exemption determination, the appeal letter, the responses to the    |
| 19 | appeal documents that the Planning Department prepared, the other written records before        |
| 20 | the Board of Supervisors and all of the public testimony made in support of and opposed to      |
| 21 | the exemption determination appeal; and   |
| 22 | WHEREAS, Following the conclusion of the public hearing, the Board of Supervisors               |
| 23 | conditionally reversed the exemption determination for the Project subject to the adoption of   |
| 24 | written findings of the Board in support of such determination based on the written record      |

25

before the Board of Supervisors as well as all of the testimony at the public hearing in support of and opposed to the appeal; and WHEREAS, The written record and oral testimony in support of and opposed to the appeal and the oral and written testimony at the public hearing before the Board of Supervisors by all parties and the public in support of and opposed to the appeal of the exemption determination, including the deliberations by the members of the Board, is in the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors File No. 230592, and is incorporated in this Motion as though set forth in its entirety; now, therefore, be it MOVED, That the Board of Supervisors conditionally reverses the determination by the Planning Department that the project is exempt from environmental review, subject to the adoption of written findings of the Board in support of this determination. n:\land\as2020\1900434\01685196.docx