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[Affirming the Exemption Determination - 601 Dolores Street]

Motion affirming the determination by the Planning Department that a project located at 601 Dolores Street is exempt from environmental review.

WHEREAS, The Planning Department has determined that a project located at 601 Dolores Street is exempt from environmental review under the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA"), the CEQA Guidelines, and San Francisco Administrative Code Chapter 31. The proposed project involves the conversion of an existing residential use in a former church structure into middle-school class rooms and a multi-purpose assembly space and associated interior and exterior changes to the building. By letter to the Clerk of the Board, Jeffery Goldfarb and Elizabeth Erhardt of Rutan & Tucker, LLP, on behalf of J. Landon Gates and Anne Timmer Gates, (Appellants) received by the Clerk’s Office on May 9, 2012, appealed the exemption determination. The Appellants provided a copy a Certificate of Determination, Exemption From Environmental Review, issued by the Planning Department on April 9, 2012, finding the proposed project exempt from environmental review under CEQA Guidelines Class 32 (14 Cal. Code. Regs. §15332); and

WHEREAS, On June 19, 2012, this Board held a duly noticed public hearing to consider the appeal of the exemption determination filed by Appellants, and following the public hearing affirmed the exemption determination; and

WHEREAS, In reviewing the appeal of the exemption determination, this Board reviewed and considered the exemption determination, the appeal letters, the responses to concerns document that the Planning Department prepared, the other written records before the Board of Supervisors and all of the public testimony made in support of and opposed to the exemption determination appeal. Following the conclusion of the public hearing, the Board
of Supervisors affirmed the exemption determination for the project based on the written
record before the Board of Supervisors as well as all of the testimony at the public hearing in
support of and opposed to the appeal. The written record and oral testimony in support of and
opposed to the appeal and deliberation of 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 is in the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors File No.
120495 and is incorporated in this motion as though set forth in its entirety; now therefore be it
MOVED, That the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco
hereby adopts as its own and incorporates by reference in this motion, as though fully set
forth, the exemption determination; and be it

FURTHER MOVED, That the Board of Supervisors finds that based on the whole
record before it there are no substantial project changes, no substantial changes in project
circumstances, and no new information of substantial importance that would change the
conclusions set forth in the exemption determination by the Planning Department that the
proposed project at its various locations is exempt from environmental review; and be it

FURTHER MOVED, That after carefully considering the appeal of the exemption
determination, including the written information submitted to the Board of Supervisors and the
public testimony presented to the Board of Supervisors at the hearing on the exemption
determination, this Board concludes that the project at its various locations qualifies for a
exemption determination under CEQA.