| 1 | General Plan Amendment - Chinese Hospital Special Use District] |
|--------|---|
| 2 | |
| 3 | Ordinance amending the San Francisco General Plan by amending Policy 1.2 and Map 1 of the |
| 4 | Chinatown Area Plan to facilitate development of the Chinese Hospital Replacement Project at 835 and |
| 5 | 345 Jackson Street (Assessor's Block No. 0192, Lot No. 041); and making findings, including |
| 6 | environmental findings and findings of consistency with the General Plan and Planning Code sections |
| 7 | 101.1 and 340. |
| 8 9 | NOTE: Additions are <u>single-underline italics Times New Roman</u> ; deletions are <u>strike through italics Times New Roman</u> . Board amendment additions are <u>double-underlined</u> ; |
| 10 | Board amendment deletions are strikethrough normal. |
| 11 | |
| 12 | Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco: |
| 13 | Section 1. Findings. The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby finds ar |
| 14 | determines that: |
| 15 | (a) General Plan and Planning Code Findings. |
| 16 | (1) Pursuant to San Francisco Charter Section 4.105 and Planning Code Section 340, any |
| 17 | amendments to the General Plan shall first be considered by the Planning Commission and thereafter |
| 18 | recommended for approval or rejection by the Board of Supervisors. On, the Commission |
| 19 | conducted a duly noticed public hearing on the proposed General Plan Amendments pursuant to Planning Code |
| 20 | Section 340 and, by Resolution No, adopted the General Plan Amendments, and |
| 21 | recommended them for approval to the Board of Supervisors. A copy of Planning Commission Resolution No. |
| 22 | is on file with the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors in File No |
| 23 | (2) The Board of Supervisors finds that the proposed General Plan amendments are in conformity |
| 24 | with the priority policies of Planning Code Section 101.1 and on balance is consistent with the General Plan as |
| 25 | |

Planning Commission
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

| 1 | is proposed for amendment nerein, and nereby adopts the findings set forth in Planning Commission Resolution |
|----|---|
| 2 | No and incorporates such findings herein by reference. |
| 3 | (3) Pursuant to Planning Code Section 340, the Board finds that the proposed General Plan |
| 4 | amendments will serve the public necessity, convenience and welfare for the reasons set forth in Planning |
| 5 | Commission Resolution No, which reasons are incorporated herein by reference as though |
| 6 | fully set forth. |
| 7 | (b) Environmental Findings. On, at a duly noticed public hearing, the Planning |
| 8 | Commission, reviewed and considered a Final Environmental Impact Report (Final EIR) for the Chinese Hospital |
| 9 | Replacement Project (Project) and found that the contents of the Final EIR and the procedures through which |
| 10 | the Final EIR was prepared, publicized, and reviewed complied with the provisions of California Environmental |
| 11 | Quality Act (California Public Resources Code section 21000 et seq.) ("CEQA"), 14 California Code of |
| 12 | Regulations sections 15000 et seq. ("the CEQA Guidelines"), and Chapter 31 of the San Francisco |
| 13 | Administrative Code ("Chapter 31"). |
| 14 | The Planning Commission found the Final EIR was adequate, accurate and objective, reflected the |
| 15 | independent analysis and judgment of the Department and the Commission, and that the summary of comments |
| 16 | and responses contained no significant revisions to the Draft EIR, and certified the Final EIR for the Project in |
| 17 | compliance with CEQA, the CEQA Guidelines, and Chapter 31. Additionally, Planning Department staff prepared |
| 18 | a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program ("MMRP") for the Project, which is attached to Planning |
| 19 | Commission Motion No The Final EIR, the MMRP and all supporting documents and files |
| 20 | have been made available to the public, the Planning Commission, and this Board for review, consideration and |
| 21 | action. |
| 22 | The Planning Commission Secretary is the custodian of records for the Project's environmental review, |
| 23 | located in the File for Case No. 2008.0762E, at 1650 Mission Street, Fourth Floor, San Francisco, California. |
| 24 | On, at a duly noticed public hearing, in recommending approval of the proposed |
| 25 | Planning Code amendments and approving the Project, the Planning Commission adopted approval findings |
| | Planning Commission BOARD OF SUPERVISORS Page : |

| 2 | Motion No Additionally, the Planning Commission adopted the MMRP, which is attached to |
|----|--|
| 3 | Planning Commission Motion No and incorporated by reference. Planning Commission Motion |
| 4 | No and the MMRP are on file with the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors in File No. |
| 5 | and are hereby incorporated herein by reference as though fully set forth in this Ordinance. |
| 6 | This Board finds that these Planning Code amendments are within the scope of the Final EIR and the Planning |
| 7 | Commission's adopted CEQA findings and MMRP. This Board hereby affirms the Planning Commission's |
| 8 | certification of the Final EIR and adopts the CEQA approval findings set forth in Planning Commission Motion |
| 9 | No as its own and adopts the MMRP. |
| 10 | (c) General Findings. |
| 11 | (1) The properties commonly known as 835 and 845 Jackson Street on Block 0192, Lot 041 are |
| 12 | located on the south side of Jackson Street, between Powell and Stockton Streets in the Chinatown area of the |
| 13 | City and County of San Francisco. The properties are within the Chinatown Residential Neighborhood |
| 14 | Commercial District and within a 65-N Height and Bulk District. Block 0192, Lot 041 currently contains three (3) |
| 15 | structures: 835 Jackson Street currently serves as a medical administration building for hospital administration |
| 16 | and outpatient healthcare services, 845 Jackson Street is the existing five-story hospital, and behind 835 |
| 17 | Jackson Street is a three-story parking structure. No undeveloped space currently exists for the development of |
| 18 | a new hospital. |
| 19 | (2) To provide for the future healthcare needs of Chinatown and the local community and to comply |
| 20 | with the seismic retrofit requirements for all acute care hospitals imposed by the Office of Statewide Health |
| 21 | Planning and Development ("OSHPD"), the Chinese Hospital, which is a community-owned nonprofit |
| 22 | organization, proposes to replace the buildings located at 835 Jackson Street (the 1924-era original hospital |
| 23 | building, now used for administration and outpatient services and the related parking structure) with a new eight- |
| 24 | story hospital and convert the existing hospital at 845 Jackson Street to a medical center use with outpatient |
| 25 | clinic services. Without amendment, the Planning Code would not allow the proposed development of a new |
| | Planning Commission |

under CEQA, including findings rejecting alternatives and adopting a statement of overriding considerations, by

1

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

hospital on the site, and the Chinatown Area Plan of the General Plan would not permit the requisite height and design of the Chinese Hospital Project.

(3) The Chinese Hospital Special Use District is being established and these conforming amendments to the General Plan are being proposed in order to allow the sponsor to develop a new Chinese Hospital on the subject site to the proposed bulk and height.

Section 2. The San Francisco General Plan is hereby amended by amending Policy 1.2 of the Chinatown Area Plan, to read as follows:

POLICY 1.2 Promote a building form that harmonizes with the scale of existing buildings and width of Chinatown's streets.

The Chinatown area is primarily composed of small-scaled buildings. Most existing buildings are quite low and due to the pattern of the lots, many are relatively short in depth as well. The typical lot size is only 3,500 square feet. The few large buildings in the area intrude into this fine-scaled texture of development. Further development along these lines would severely damage the appearance of this historic part of the city and would also produce deeply shadowed streets.

Urban design guidelines should be applied to new construction in Chinatown, other than construction within the Chinese Hospital Special Use District, in order to (1) integrate new buildings into the dominant fine scale of development characterized by small varied buildings in a manner that does not create sharp contrasts in scale or significantly alter the texture of the area as viewed from surrounding areas and (2) maintain the unifying rhythm of facade widths and the general scale of street walls as viewed from the streets. Generally, buildings above a height of 40 feet should not exceed a width (measured parallel to the street) of 50 to 75 feet or a maximum diagonal of 100 feet. As buildings approach these dimensions, increasingly stronger measures will be required to minimize the apparent bulk and scale of the project and insure a harmonious fit with the contextual setting. Larger projects may necessitate division of the facade into independent designs, changes of height of several floors and setbacks to achieve the desired relationship.

Planning Commission

| 1 | These design controls have been presented as guidelines rather than rigid rules. This is essential given |
|----|--|
| 2 | the wide range of sites and situations in which a project may be proposed. The ultimate development potential in |
| 3 | a given property is dependent not only on the zoning and height limit by also on the nature of surrounding |
| 4 | development. |
| 5 | |
| 6 | Section 3. The Board of Supervisors hereby approves the following amendments to Map 1 of the |
| 7 | Chinatown Area Plan of the General Plan: |
| 8 | Map 1 of the Chinatown Area Plan is amended to reference a height limit of 110 feet on Block 0192, Lot |
| 9 | 041. |
| 10 | |
| 11 | Section 4. The Board of Supervisors hereby approves the following amendment to the General Plan |
| 12 | Land Use Index: |
| 13 | The Land Use Index shall be updated as necessary to reflect the amendments set forth in Sections 2 |
| 14 | and 3, above. |
| 15 | |
| 16 | Section 5. Effective Date. This ordinance shall become effective 30 days from the date of passage. |
| 17 | |
| 18 | Section 6. In enacting this Ordinance, the Board intends to amend only those words, phrases, |
| 19 | paragraphs, subsections, sections, articles, numbers, punctuation, charts, diagrams, or any other constituent |
| 20 | part of the General Plan that are explicitly shown in this legislation as additions, deletions, Board amendment |
| 21 | additions, and Board amendment deletions in accordance with the "Note" that appears under the official title of |
| 22 | the legislation. |
| 23 | |
| 24 | APPROVED AS TO FORM: DENNIS J. HERRERA, City Attorney |
| 25 | |

| 1 | Marlena G. Byrne |
|----|----------------------|
| 2 | Deputy City Attorney |
| 3 | |
| 4 | |
| 5 | |
| 6 | |
| 7 | |
| 8 | |
| 9 | |
| 10 | |
| 11 | |
| 12 | |
| 13 | |
| 14 | |
| 15 | |
| 16 | |
| 17 | |
| 18 | |
| 19 | |
| 20 | |
| 21 | |
| 22 | |
| 23 | |
| 24 | |
| 25 | |

Ву:

Planning Commission
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS