



SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Executive Summary Planning Code Text Amendment

HEARING DATE: AUGUST 13, 2015

Project Name: **2015 Code Corrections Ordinance**
Case Number: **2015-005859PCA [Board File No. TBD]**
Initiated by: Planning Commission / Initiated July 16, 2015
Staff Contact: Aaron Starr, Manager of Legislative Affairs
aaron.starr@sfgov.org, 415-558-6362
Recommendation: **Recommend Approval with Modifications**

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

Reception:
415.558.6378

Fax:
415.558.6409

Planning
Information:
415.558.6377

PLANNING CODE AMENDMENT

Ordinance amending the Planning Code to correct errors, reenact previously-existing language that was repealed in error as part of the Article 2 Reorganization Ordinance, update the Code, and make nonsubstantive language revisions to simplify and clarify text.

The Way It Is Now:

The Planning Code contains various errors, improper and outdated cross-references, lack of clarity, grammar mistakes, and incorrect illustrations.

The Way It Would Be:

The proposed ordinance seeks to correct these errors.

BACKGROUND

The Planning Code is amended approximately 30-40 times a year. While each ordinance is reviewed by Planning Staff and the City Attorney's office for consistency and accuracy, the number of changes that occur and the complexity of the Planning Code mean that not all errors are caught before final adoption. Further, even though these are typically minor errors, they cannot be fixed without a legislative change. From time to time, the Planning Department collects all of the reported Planning Code errors and compiles them into a Code Corrections Ordinance. The last time this was done was in November 2012. On July 18, 2015 the Planning Commission initiated this Code Corrections Ordinance.

ISSUES AND CONSIDERATIONS

Updating Out-Of-Date Language

A significant portion of the 2015 Code Corrections Ordinance is updating out-of-date language. Three of the most common corrections are changing "Master Plan" to "General Plan", "Department of City Planning" to "Planning Department," and "City Planning Commission" to "Planning Commission."

When San Francisco first started comprehensive planning for the City in 1945, the resulting document was called the Master Plan. In 1976, the California State Legislature mandated that cities prepare General Plans. It's believed that the City changed the name of the Master Plan to General Plan around this time; however the term Master Plan still persists in several areas of the Planning Code. This Code Corrections

Ordinance seeks to eliminate all references to the Master Plan and replace it with references to the General Plan.

San Francisco is a unique place in many ways, but one of its lesser known claims to fame is that it is the only municipality in California that is both a city and a county. There are a lot of places in the Planning Code that refer to the “Department of City Planning” or “City Planning Commission;” however since the Planning Department and Planning Commission serve both the city and the county of San Francisco, limiting these entities to just the city is inaccurate. The Department has been changing these inaccurate references over the past couple of years whenever they come up in a proposed ordinance. This Code Corrections Ordinance may have gotten just about all of them.

Misspellings and Incorrect Planning Code References

Perhaps the next most common occurrences in the 2015 Code Correction Ordinance are fixes to misspelling and incorrect section references. Misspellings run the gamut between formula vs formal, principal vs. principle, plague vs plaque, etc. Incorrect section references are all over the Planning Code, mostly caused by past ordinances that moved certain section of the Code, but did not also change pertinent references. A significant number of these in the 2015 Code Correction’s Ordinance were caused when Planning Department fees were moved from Article 3 to Article 4 of the Planning Code. Most of the incorrect references in the Article 2 zoning controls tables were a result of the Article 2 Reorganization Ordinance (hereinafter Article 2 Ordinance).

Article 2 Ordinance Corrections

On July 24, 2012, the Planning Commission initiated the Article 2 Ordinance, a 560 page ordinance that consolidate definitions into Section 102 of the Planning Code, reorganized Article 2 to create Zoning Control Tables, and made other non-substantive changes to various sections in Articles 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7 and 8 in order to update, clarify, and simplify Code language. On November 20, 2014, the Planning Commission recommended approval of this ordinance to the Full Board of Supervisors, and on March 22 of this year the Article 2 Ordinance became effective. This Ordinance includes clean-up pieces from the Article 2 Ordinance, such as omission and incorrect references. Some errors are very minor, like incorrect references (see above) and minor typos, others were more significant; both are included in the 2015 Code Corrections Ordinance. The following is a list of the significant corrections that are a result of the Article 2 Reorganization:

Page 5, Line 15

Proposed Correction: Change “inpatient and outpatient medical care” to “inpatient or outpatient medical care.”

The change from an “or” to an “and” was mistakenly made as part of the Article 2 Ordinance and incorrectly limited what a Hospital could be. This change will fix that mistake.

Pages 9-11, Line 7

Proposed Correction: Add Table 124, Basic Floor Area Ratio (FAR) Limits, back to the Planning Code.

One of the main changes in the Article 2 Ordinance was the creation of Zoning Control Tables for all zoning districts in Article 2. Table 124 was deleted as part of the Article 2 Ordinance because it repeats FAR information that was already promulgated in the zoning control tables. The deletion was intended to remove duplicative information that often does not get revised when FAR limits are changed. However, it was discovered after Article 2 Ordinance became effective that zoning control tables for several zoning district in Article 8 do not include FAR limits. For now, the Department is proposing that

Table 124 be put back in the Planning Code until Zoning Control Tables in Article 8 can be reformatted and amended to include FAR limits.

Page 52, Line 18-19

Proposed Correction: Amend the height controls in Table 209.1 as follows, "No portion of a Dwelling Buildings may ~~not~~ be taller than 35 feet."

Proposed for further modifications, see Recommendation #1 below.

Page 53, Line 9

Proposed Correction: Removal of Parking Lot controls under Street Frontage and Public Realm Section in Table 209.1

These uses controls were placed under the wrong section of the Table 209.1, and they are also the wrong controls for parking lots in RH Districts.

Page 53, Line 18

Proposed Correction: Add conditional use requirement for Private Parking Lots in RH districts.

Table 209.1 incorrectly prohibits private parking lots in RH districts. Prior to the Article 2 Ordinance, private parking lots were permitted with conditional use authorization in all RH zoning Districts.

Page 55, Lines 8-9

Proposed Correction: Add conditional use requirement for Private Parking Lots in RM districts.

Table 209.2 incorrectly prohibits private parking lots in RM districts. Prior to the Article 2 Ordinance private parking lots were permitted with conditional use authorization in all RM zoning Districts.

Page 55, Lines 12-14

Proposed Correction: Count 500 sq. ft. units as three-quarters of a unit in RM-4 districts

Prior to the Article 2 Ordinance, units that were less than 500 sq. ft. were counted as three-quarters of a unit in RM-4 Zoning Districts. This change will add this provision back to the Planning Code.

Page 56, Line 20

Proposed Correction: Add conditional use requirement for Private Parking Lots in RC districts.

Table 209.3 incorrectly prohibits private parking lots in RC districts. Prior to the Article 2 Ordinance private parking lots were permitted with conditional use authorization in all RC zoning districts.

Page 57, Line 4

Proposed Correction: Prohibit Massage establishment in RC districts

Prior to the Article 2 Ordinance, Massage Establishments were not permitted in RC districts. This Ordinance will add this provision back to the Planning Code.

Page 57, Lines 7-10

Proposed Correction: Count 500 sq. ft. units as three-quarters of a unit in RC-4 districts

Prior to the Article 2 Ordinance, units that were less than 500 sq. ft. were counted as three-quarters of a unit in RC-4 zoning districts. This change will add this provision back to the Planning Code.

Page 59, Lines 24-25

Proposed Correction: Delete the following text – “Limited Commercial Uses may be conditionally permitted in historic buildings subject to § 186.3.”

Section 186.3 only applies to RH and RM Districts; it does not apply to RTO Districts. This text is being removed because it is inaccurate.

Page 60, Lines 8-9

Proposed Correction: Add conditional use requirement for Private Parking Lots in RTO districts.

Table 209.4 incorrectly prohibits private parking lots in RTO districts. Prior to the Article 2 Ordinance private parking lots were permitted with conditional use authorization in all RTO zoning districts.

Page 60, Lines 13-17

Proposed Correction: Count 500 sq. ft. units as three-quarters of a unit in RTO districts

Prior to the Article 2 Ordinance, units that were less than 500 sq. ft. were counted as three-quarters of a unit in RTO zoning districts. This change will add this provision back to the Planning Code.

Page 62, Lines 2-6

Proposed Change: Amend Table 210.1 to require CU for Parking Garages and Parking Lots in C-2 zoning districts.

One part of the NE Ordinance (BF 120881, Enactment #232-14) amended the Planning Code to require CU authorization for parking lots and parking garages in C-2 districts. Because of some overlap in the drafting of the Article 2 Ordinance and the effective date of the NE Ordinance, this change was not included in the final draft of the Article 2 Ordinance. This amendment will require CU authorization for Private Parking Lots and Garages, and Public Parking Lots in C-2 districts. Public Parking Garages already require CU authorization.

Page 62, Lines 22-24

Proposed Correction: Amend the residential parking controls for C-3 Districts in Table 210.2.

This amendment amends the Table 210.2 to be consistent with the residential parking controls for C-3 districts in Section 151.1. A portion of the NE Ordinance (BF 120881, Enactment #232-14) amended the Planning Code by increasing the number of parking spaces that were permitted as of right, and capped the number of parking spaces allowed with CU authorization in C-3 Districts. Because of some overlap in the drafting of the Article 2 Ordinance and the effective date of the NE Ordinance, this change was not included in the final draft of the Article 2 Ordinance.

Page 63, Lines 21-24

Proposed Correction: Amend Table 210.2 “C-3 Zoning Districts” to make Public and Private Parking Lots in C-3-S Districts not permitted.

A portion of the NE Ordinance (BF 120881, Enactment #232-14) amended the Planning Code by prohibiting Public and Private Parking Lots in the C-3-S District. Because of some overlap in the drafting of the Article 2 Ordinance and the effective date of the NE Ordinance, this change was not included in the final draft of the Article 2 Ordinance.

Page 65, Lines 3-5

Proposed Correction: Amend Table 210.3 to require CU for Offices in Landmark Buildings

Board File 140876 (Enactment #26-15) amended the Planning Code to require CU for Offices in Landmark Buildings. Prior to this they were principally permitted. Due to overlap, Board File 140876 and the Article 2 Ordinance were never reconciled to integrate the changes in PDR controls to the new Zoning Control Table.

Page 65, Line 24

Proposed Correction: Amend the Non-Retail Sales and Service Use controls for PDR district to be clearer.

The controls for Non-Retail Sales and Service Uses are being changed from Permitted (P) to Not Permitted (NP). This control also has an existing footnote that clarifies that these uses are not permitted unless in a designated landmark. Since the default control is actually NP and not P, this control is being amended to be more accurate and clearer.

Page 73, Line 11

Proposed Correction: Add “except for Motels and Hotels” to what is permitted in the Bayshore Boulevard Home Improvement Special Use District.

Prior to the Article 2 ordinance, Hotels and Motels were categorized as “Other Housing.” Now they are categorized as Retail Sales and Service uses. As part of the Article 2 reorganization, Section 249.65 was amended to allow Retail Sales and Services as defined in Section 102, which includes Hotels and Motels. Since Hotels and Motels were not previously permitted, this language is being added to clarify the controls.

Page 80, Line 8

Proposed Correction: Add General Entertainment to Section 303 CU findings for Entertain Use CUs.

The Article 2 Ordinance moved the CU criteria for Adult Business and Other Entertainment to Section 303 (Conditional Use Procedures and Criteria). General Entertainment is a new use that is derived from the Other Entertainment Use category, and will take the place of Other Entertainment once Articles 7 and 8 are reorganized and simplified; therefore General Entertainment uses that require CU authorization should be evaluated under the same controls as Other Entertainment is today.

Page 81, Line 2

Proposed Correction: Put back the criteria for large lots developments in RTO and RTO-M Districts.

The Article 2 Ordinance kept the CU requirement for large lot developments in RTO and RTO-M Districts, but inadvertently deleted the CU criteria for large lots developments in these districts. This correction will put these criteria back in the Code under Section 303 (CU Procedures and Criteria).

Other Proposed Corrections

The following is a summary of other proposed corrections in the ordinance that aren’t simply an incorrect section number, or misspelling. The changes include among other things, clarifications, removal of outdated or contradictory text, and deletion of erroneously placed graphics.

Page 12, Lines 12-24

Proposed Correction: Delete list of zoning districts where the subject controls apply.

Section 134 lists all of the zoning districts that are covered under this section in the title, the introduction paragraph, and when the requirements are described. The proposed change will delete the list of zoning

districts in the introduction because they are unnecessary, complicate this section of the Code, and are often not updated when new districts or controls are added to this section.

Page 13, Lines 5-6 and Page 14 Lines 2-3

Proposed Correction: Correct the Pacific Avenue Rear Yard Controls in Section 134.

According to Table 732, the rear yard requirement for the Pacific Avenue NCD is actually 45 percent of the rear yard depth and not 25 percent, as implied in this Section. The proposed change seeks to clarify this requirement and make Section 134 consistent with Section 732.

Page 13, Lines 9-10, Page 14, Lines 11-12 and 22

Proposed Correction: Deleting the provision that makes required rear yard exceptions only apply to SROs in the SoMa Mixed Use Districts and Eastern Neighborhoods Mixed Use Districts.

See Recommendation 3 below

Page 17, Lines 17-18

Proposed Correction: Add “Driveway” to Table 1, Pedestrian and Streetscape Elements.

Driveways are a physical element discussed in the Better Streets Plan, but was left out of this chart. This change seeks to correct that error.

Page 25-36

Proposed Correction: Amendments to the Table 155.2 Bicycle Parking Spaces Required

This proposed correction seeks to make the uses listed in Table 155.2 (bike parking requirements) consistent with the uses listed in Section 102 in order to make implementing these requirements easier. A similar effort is underway for Section 151, and 151.1 (parking requirements and maximums), but those changes require more substantive and thorough policy discussion, so they have been folded into a separate ordinance that will be considered at a later date.

Pages 37 and 38

Proposed Correction: Amendments to the Table 155.4 Requirements for Shower Facilities and Lockers

Similar to the changes to Table 155.2, this proposed correction seeks to make the uses listed in Section 155.4 consistent with the uses listed in Section 102 to make implementing these requirements easier.

Page 44, Line 8-20

Proposed Change: Reword and reorganize existing text in Section 186.1

The existing language is confusing. The proposed amends clarify this section, but make no substantive changes.

Page 48, Lines 4-18

Proposed Change: Clarify location and operational conditions for Medical Cannabis Dispensaries.

The language proposed for deletion address MCDs that were in operation before 2005 and located within 1000 feet of a School or Recreational Facility. These uses were grandfathered in by this language. All of the MCDs affected by this Section have gone through the permitting process, making this confusing and overly wordy language unnecessary.

Page 51, Lines 5-6

Proposed Change: Eliminate contradictory language from Section 207(b)(1)

The language proposed for deletion contradicts the statement in the following sentence. A recent ordinance (BF140036, Ordinance Num. 152-14) amended how we calculate density by allowing fractions of one half or more to be rounded up, allowing one additional unit.

Page 76, Lines 1-20

Proposed Correction: Delete Chart C

Chart C appears in and pertains to Section 270. For some reason it was also included in Section 271, where it is not relevant. The proposed change will correct this error by deleting it.

Page 88, line 4

Proposed Correction: Make the Planning Code's controls consistent with the City Charter.

The City Charter states that Planning Commission interim controls can be over turned by the Board of Supervisor's with a majority vote. The Planning Code states that the Board needs a unanimous vote to overturn Commission interim controls. In all cases, the City's Charter overrides the Planning Code. This change will make the Planning Code consistent with the City's Charter.

Page 110, Line 16 and 17

Proposed Correction: Delete text related for Planning Code Violations

This fee is no longer applicable for code violations so it is being removed. This fee was removed from the September 2, 2014 fee schedule.

Page 117 and 118, Lines 24-24, and 1-4

Proposed Correction: Delete of Subsection (a)(1)-(a)(3) for Section 415.3 Application

Subsection (a)(1) and subsection (a)(2) are proposed for deletion because they negate each other and are unnecessary. Subsection (a)(3) is proposed for deletion because Live Work Lofts are no longer permitted.

Page 118, Lines 18 and 20-21

Proposed Correction: Deleted reference to the Building Code and add language establishing a reasonable time for refund.

"Building Code" is proposed for deletion because it doesn't require fees. If a permit requires review by the Planning Department, that fee is promulgated in the Planning Code. The reference to the Building Code is unnecessary and inaccurate. Staff is proposing that the proposed language on lines 20-21 be further refined as part of Recommendation #4 below.

Page 122, Line 12

Proposed Correction: Add "received no height increase" to this Section.

This is clarifying language. Tier 1 is supposed to include projects that did not benefit or only benefited slightly from the height increases in the Eastern Neighborhoods rezoning, including projects that received an eight foot height increase and a decrease in height. Implied in that statement are projects that did not receive a height increase at all. This change will make that explicit.

Page 125, Lines 18-19

Proposed Correction: Correct the title of Table 424.5A.

This chart is an exact copy of the Market and Octavia Community Improvement Fee in Section 421. When the table was added to the Code it was likely cut and pasted into the proposed ordinance without correcting the title. This change will make sure the title of the table match the title of the Code section.

Page 126, Lines 23-25

Proposed Correction: Delete Text in Subsection (c)(3)

This subsection is being deleted because it contains a reference that does not exist. The referenced provision, 123(e)(1), was incorporated into the adopted TCDP Planning Code ordinance as an uncodified provision.

Page 127, Lines 4-20

Proposed Correction: Delete text from Subsection (c)

Board File 130549 (Ordinance #263-13) supersedes this section on Controller's responsibilities to file the required report.

Page 128, Lines 13-15

Proposed Correction: Delete Text in Subsection (c)(5)

This subsection is being deleted because it contains a reference that does not exist. The text from the referenced provision, 123(e)(1), was incorporated into the adopted TCDP Planning Code ordinance as an uncodified provision.

Pages 128 and 129, Lines 20-25 and 1-11

Proposed Correction: Delete subsection (c) of Section 424.7.4

Board File 130549 (Ordinance #263-13) supersedes this section on Controller's responsibilities to file the required report.

Page 129, Line 13

Proposed Correction: Delete "In C-3 Districts" from the Section 429 title.

The public art requirement in Section 429 applies to more districts than just C-3 districts. This change is proposed to make the title more accurate.

Page 131, Lines 18-21

Proposed Correction: Delete language in Section 604(c)

The language proposed for deletion is confusing, and circular. The proposed correction will replace it with clearer, more straightforward language.

Page 132, Line 16

Proposed Correction: Add "one nonilluminated or directly illuminated" to nameplate controls in Section 607.2.

All other signs in these districts are permitted to be nonilluminated or directly illuminated. This change is clarifying that nameplate signs can also be.

Page 132, Line 25

Proposed Correction: Strike “or signs combined when there are multiple signs” from Section 607.2(f)(1)(C) This language contradicts the previous sentence. If there can only be one sign per business then there cannot be multiple signs.

Page 133-134, Lines 7, 10-12, 21-24, and 1-4

Proposed Correction: Add references to Special Use Districts within Article 6, Sign Controls. Some Special Use Districts (SUDs) also have sign controls; the purpose behind this added language is to provide a reference to these SUDs in Article 6 of the Code.

Page 136, Line 7

Proposed Correction: Delete language, “and shall be set back three feet from the front property line.” The Formula Retail Ordinance (Board File 140844, Ordinance # 235-14) removed the three foot setback rule for ATM machines throughout the City; however the ordinance missed this one reference. Striking this language is intended to fix this omission.

Page 137, Line 19

Proposed Correction: Delete “movie theaters” from the description of what is not permitted in SALI zoning Districts. The zoning control table for SALI districts allows movie theaters with up to three screens. This proposed change seeks to make the description of the zoning district consistent with the actual land use controls in the district.

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.

RECOMMENDATION

The Department recommends that the Commission recommend *approval with modifications* of the proposed Ordinance and adopt the attached Draft Resolution to that effect.

The Department’s proposed recommendations are as follows:

Recommendation 1: Add clarifying language to the height and bulk limits in table 209.1

Page 52, Line 18: Amend text in Height and Bulk Limits for RH Districts to say the following (proposed modification in double underlined text):

No portion of a Dwelling Buildings may ~~not~~ be taller than 35 feet; Structures with uses other than Dwellings may be constructed to the prescribed height limit, which is generally 40 feet. Per § 261 the height limit may be decreased or increased based on the slope of the lot.

Recommendation 2: Add reference to Planning Code Section 260 to Section 261

Page 74, Line 13-15: Amend the text of Section 261(b)(1)(A) as follows (proposed modification in double underlined text):

The permitted ~~#~~Height of a Building, as defined in Section 102, shall be increased to 40 feet, as measured at curb per Section ~~102.12~~ 260, where the average ground elevation at the rear line of the lot is higher by 20 or more feet than at the front line thereof;

Recommendation #3: Remove proposed changes to how rear yards for building with SROs are treated in Section 134.

Page 13, Lines 9-10 (keep double underlined language) – For buildings containing only SRO ~~#~~Units *in the South of Market Mixed Use and Eastern Neighborhoods Mixed Use Districts*,

Page 14 Lines 11-12 (keep double underlined language) - SRO buildings *located in either the South of Market Mixed Use or Eastern Neighborhoods Mixed Use Districts* not exceeding a height of 65 feet...

Page 14 Lines 21-24 (keep double underlined language) – Except for ~~single room occupancy~~ SRO buildings *in the South of Market Mixed Use Districts*...

Recommendation #4: Refine proposed language in Section 415.5, “On-Site Affordable Housing Alternative”

Page 118, Lines 18 and 20-21 – Amend the proposed language as follows - “An application for a refund must be made within ~~a reasonable amount of time~~ six months from the issuance of the first certificate of occupancy.”

Recommendation #5: Allow the City Attorney’s Office to add additional non-substantive amendments to this Code Corrections Ordinance as it moves through the Board of Supervisors should any further corrections be identified.

BASIS FOR RECOMMENDATION

The Planning Department recommends approval of the proposed ordinance because it will help the readability, usability and accuracy of the Planning Code. The Planning Code is amended approximately 30-40 times a year. While each ordinance is reviewed by Planning Staff and the City Attorney’s office for consistency and accuracy, the number of changes that occur and the complexity of the Planning Code mean that not all errors are caught before final adoption. This ordinance will fix a substantial number of the identified errors in the Planning Code.

Recommendation 1: Add clarifying language to the height and bulk limits in table 209.1

Staff met with the Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods (CSFN) after this Ordinance was initiated by the Planning Commission. As a result of that meeting, staff agreed to add this language, which further clarifies the height requirements in RH-1 Districts.

Recommendation 2: Add reference to Planning Code Section 260 to Section 261

Staff met with CSFN after this proposed ordinance was initiated by the Planning Commission. As a result of that meeting, staff agreed to add this language, which clarifies how height is measured in RH Districts.

Recommendation #3: Remove proposed changes to how rear yards for building with SRO are treated in Section 134.

Member of CSFN correctly pointed out that deleting this text would allow SROs in RH districts the ability to reduce their rear yard requirement, where currently this provision is only limited to SROs in the South of Market area. SROs are limited to 350 square feet, and the density and group housing controls in RH districts make them a less financially feasible than regular sized units in RH Districts; however the proposed change not a correction and does not need to be deleted to clarify or correct any other issue. Therefore, staff is recommending that it be kept in the Code and not deleted.

Recommendation #4: Refine proposed language in Section 415.5, “On-Site Affordable Housing Alternative”

This language is being proposed because there is currently no deadline for when a refund requested under this Section of the Code needs to be filed, opening up the possibility that developers could seek the refund several years after the certificate of occupancy was issued. Staff is proposing to further refine the language in order to make it less ambiguous. Six months was chosen because that is the same amount of time that the Administrative Codes and other section of the Planning Code give for when refunds can be processed for applications.

Recommendation #5: Allow the City Attorney’s Office to add additional non-substantive amendments to this Code Corrections Ordinance as it moves through the Board of Supervisors should any further corrections be identified.

Other needed corrections may be discovered in the process of bringing this ordinance to the Board. Rather than waiting for another Code Corrections Ordinance to make those corrections, staff is requesting that the Commission include this recommendation in their motion.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

The proposed amendments are not defined as a project under CEQA Guidelines Section 15060(c) and 15378 because it does not result in a physical change in the environment.

PUBLIC COMMENT

The Department received feedback from the Coalition of San Francisco neighborhoods, and some modifications to this Ordinance are being recommended as a result of that feedback.

RECOMMENDATION: Recommendation of Approval with Modification
--

Attachments:

- Exhibit A: Draft Planning Commission Resolution
- Exhibit B: Initiated Code Corrections Ordinance

1 **APPENDIX A TO ARTICLE 10 - LIST OF DESIGNATED LANDMARKS**

2

Landmark No.	Name of Landmark	Location by Address	Assessor's Block/Lot*	Effective Date
****	****	****	****	****
238	The Labor Temple/Redstone Building	2926-2948 16th Street	3553/014	1/16/2004
****	****	****	****	****

3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
Section 3. Effective Date. This ordinance shall become effective 30 days after enactment. Enactment occurs when the Mayor signs the ordinance, the Mayor returns the ordinance unsigned or does not sign the ordinance within ten days of receiving it, or the Board of Supervisors overrides the Mayor's veto of the ordinance.

13
14
15
16
17
18
19
Section 4. Scope of Ordinance. In enacting this ordinance, the Board of Supervisors intends to amend only those words, phrases, paragraphs, subsections, sections, articles, numbers, punctuation marks, charts, diagrams, or any other constituent parts of the Municipal Code that are explicitly shown in this ordinance as additions, deletions, Board amendment additions, and Board amendment deletions in accordance with the "Note" that appears under the official title of the ordinance.

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

22 By: 
23 JUDITH A. BOYAJIAN
24 Deputy City Attorney

25 n:\legaha\as2015\1500840\01041833.doc