



# PLANNING COMMISSION RESOLUTION NO. 21395

**HEARING DATE: SEPTEMBER 28, 2023**

**Project Name:** Code Corrections Ordinance 2023  
**Case Number:** 2022-012067PCA  
**Staff Contact:** Audrey Merlone, Legislative Affairs  
Audrey.Merlone@sfgov.org, 628-652-7534  
**Reviewed by:** Aaron Starr, Manager of Legislative Affairs  
aaron.starr@sfgov.org, 628-652-7533

**RESOLUTION APPROVING A PROPOSED ORDINANCE THAT WOULD MAKE AMENDMENTS TO THE PLANNING CODE TO CORRECT TYPOGRAPHICAL ERRORS, UPDATE OUTDATED CROSS-REFERENCES, AND MAKE NON-SUBSTANTIVE LANGUAGE REVISIONS TO CLARIFY/SIMPLIFY CODE LANGUAGE. RESOLUTION; ADOPTING FINDINGS, INCLUDING ENVIRONMENTAL FINDINGS, PLANNING CODE SECTION 302 FINDINGS, AND FINDINGS OF CONSISTENCY WITH THE GENERAL PLAN AND PLANNING CODE SECTION 101.1.**

WHEREAS, the Planning Director periodically requests that amendments be made to the Planning Code in furtherance of the Department’s goal to make the Planning Code clear and correct; and

WHEREAS, on July 20, 2023, the Planning Commission adopted a Resolution to initiate said amendments under Resolution No. 21362; and

WHEREAS, the proposed Planning and Administrative Code text changes would amend several sections of the Code as outlined in the draft Ordinance and incorporated herein; and

WHEREAS, due to multiple changes to the Planning Code, over time text has been dropped inadvertently, amendments made by one ordinance are not reflected in subsequent legislation, and citations have become out of date; and

WHEREAS, the proposed legislation is intended to resolve the aforementioned issues; and

WHEREAS, the proposed changes in the ordinance can be classified as “good government” measures meant to improve the clarity of the Planning Code; and

WHEREAS, such changes are meant to improve the ability of decision makers, Department staff, and the public to understand, interpret, and implement the requirements of the Code; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission (hereinafter “Commission”) conducted a duly noticed public hearing at a regularly scheduled meeting to consider initiation of the proposed Ordinance on September 28, 2023; and

WHEREAS, the proposed Ordinance has been determined to be categorically exempt from environmental review under California Environmental Quality Act Sections 15378 and 15060(c)(2); and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission has heard and considered the testimony presented to it at the public hearing and has further considered written materials and oral testimony presented on behalf of Department staff and other interested parties; and

WHEREAS, all pertinent documents may be found in the files of the Department, as the Custodian of Records, at 49 South Van Ness Avenue, Suite 1400, San Francisco; and

WHEREAS, the Planning 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:

MOVED, that the Planning Commission hereby **approves with modifications** the proposed ordinance. The Commission’s proposed modifications are as follows:

The Department recommends that the Commission approve with modifications the proposed ordinance.

The Department’s proposed modifications are as follows:

1. **Section 249.92:** Reverse the FAR ratio in the Central Neighborhoods Large Residence SUD.

**SEC. 249.92**

**SEC. 308.2. APPEALS: VARIANCES AND ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIONS.**

\* \* \* \*

(b) **Notice of Appeal.** Any appeal under this Section shall be taken by filing written notice of appeal with the Board of Appeals within 10 days after the date of the written variance decision of the Zoning Administrator or within ~~15~~30 days of any other written determination of the Zoning Administrator.

less than 15%.

\* \* \* \*

Section 308.2: Change the appeal period from 15-30 days as was the intent through the Penalties for

Code Enforcement ordinance (BF 220878).

2. **Table 833:** Delete a confusing parenthetical which was erroneously added during the Article 8 Code reorganization.

**Table 833**

**MUR – MIXED USE-RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT ZONING CONTROL TABLE**

* * * *		
Zoning Category	§ References	Mixed Use-Residential District Controls
<b>NON-RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES</b>		
<b>Development Standards</b>		
* * * *	* * * *	* * * *
<b>Non-Retail Sales and Service*</b>	§ <a href="#">102</a>	P(4)
* * * *	* * * *	* * * *

\* Not listed below

(1) P in historic buildings per § 803.9(b).

## 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:

The Department supports the overall goals of the proposed Ordinance because it will increase the effectiveness of the Department’s the code enforcement program and deter future violations. The administrative penalty program has not been significantly updated since its creation in 2008, and as such, its process and penalty amounts have become less effective in inducing compliance with the Planning Code. The proposed Ordinance, with all recommended modifications, will give the Department much needed tools to increase the effectiveness of the Enforcement Division.

## General Plan Compliance

The proposed Ordinance and the Commission’s recommended modifications are consistent with the following Objectives and Policies of the General Plan:

### HOUSING ELEMENT

#### POLICY 40:

ENFORCE AND IMPROVE PLANNING PROCESSES AND BUILDING REGULATIONS TO ENSURE A HEALTHY ENVIRONMENT FOR NEW HOUSING DEVELOPMENTS, ESPECIALLY IN ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE.

*The proposed Ordinance will bring more consistency to the Planning Code, including areas that concern the development of housing. The proposed Ordinance will serve the General Plan by amending sections of the Planning Code to be consistent, clear, and concise. These amendments will improve the quality of the Planning Code and thereby make it easier for the objectives and policies of the Code to be carried out.*

### **Planning Code Section 101 Findings**

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

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

*The proposed Ordinance would not have a negative effect on neighborhood serving retail uses and will not have a negative effect on opportunities for resident employment in and ownership of neighborhood-serving retail.*

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 Ordinance would not have a negative effect on housing or neighborhood character.*

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

*The proposed Ordinance would not have an adverse effect on the City's supply of affordable housing.*

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

*The proposed Ordinance would not result in commuter traffic impeding MUNI transit service or overburdening the streets or neighborhood parking.*

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

*The proposed Ordinance would not cause displacement of the industrial or service sectors due to office development, and future opportunities for resident employment or ownership in these sectors would not be impaired.*

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

*The proposed Ordinance would not have an adverse effect on City's preparedness against injury and loss*

*of life in an earthquake.*

7. That the landmarks and historic buildings be preserved;

*The proposed Ordinance would not have an adverse effect on the City's Landmarks and historic buildings.*

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

*The proposed Ordinance would not have an adverse effect on the City's parks and open space and their access to sunlight and vistas.*

### **Planning Code Section 302 Findings.**

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

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Commission hereby APPROVES WITH MODIFICATIONS the proposed Ordinance as described in this Resolution.

I hereby certify that the foregoing Resolution was adopted by the Commission at its meeting on September 28, 2023.



Jonas P. Ionin  
Commission Secretary

Jonas P Ionin

Digitally signed by Jonas P  
Ionin  
Date: 2023.10.18 09:13:08  
-07'00'

AYES: Braun, Ruiz, Diamond, Imperial, Koppel, Moore, Tanner

NOES: None

ABSENT: None

ADOPTED: September 28, 2023