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SAN FRANCISCO CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
16. 95 NORDHOFF STREET - REQUEST A

CONDITIONAL USE AUTHORIZATION FOR THE SUBDIVISION OF AN EXISTING LOT
>> We can move on to item 16 for case number 2018-015554CUA for 95 Nordhoff Street. This is a conditional use authorization.
>> Good afternoon, President Melgar, Commissioners, Gabrielle Pentova, department staff.

The case before you is a request for conditional use authorization for the subdivision of an existing lot currently containing a single-family home into four new dwelling units -- four new lots. Sorry. Two of which will be substandard lots. The proposal will individually develop two of the proposed four lots with single-family homes, for a total of three single-family homes. And alter the existing single-family home. And one lot will remain vacant. The project site is a 7,346 square foot property located on the west side of Nordhoff Street between Stillings and Mangels Avenue within the RH-1 and 40-X Height in Bulk District. And within the Ader Mission neighborhood. The media neighborhood includes one to three story single-family homes. The
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item before you is required by planning code section
121 for the subdivision of an existing lot into four
new lots, two of which will be substandard lots.
Prior to the listed project, the project sponsor
sought to subdivide the subject lot into four
conforming lots, and develop each lot with conforming
single-family homes.
The existing lot -- the existing building of
the subject property was proposed to be demolished.
However, during the notification period, pursuant to
section 311, a discretionary review request was
submitted to the planning department. The
discretionary review applicant stated concerns with
regards to demolition of the existing single-family
home, and to the removal of an existing age redwood
tree located at the subject property.
Upon filing the discretionary review
request, discussions were had between the listed
property owner, and discretionary review applicant.
Ultimately, a compromise was reached between
both parties, which preserved both the existing
dwelling units, and the age redwood tree of the
subject property. The reached compromised is the
listed project sought under the listed conditional
use authorization application. To date, the
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department has not received any correspondence in opposition of the project. The department has received 20 correspondence in support of the project, and members of the public expressing support of the project state, the applicant and projects ability to satisfy previously raised neighborhood concerns.

The department recommends approval with conditions, and believes the project is necessary and desirable for the following reasons:

The department finds the project is on balanced and consistent with the objectives and policies of the general plan, and meets all applicable requirements of the planning code.

The project will maximize the use of a currently under-utilized lot, and will provide two additional dwelling units to the cities housing stock with a potential of a third unit to be developed at the proposed vacant lot.

The project will provide a use compatible with the $R H-1$ zoning district, and construct buildings that are compatible in size, density, height, and architectural characteristics of the immediate residential neighborhood. The proposed project will not displace any existing residential tenants of the subject, or remove any rent-controlled
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or affordable housing from the cities housing stock. This concludes staff's presentation, and I'm available for any questions.
>> Thank you. We will now hear from the project sponsor.
>> I am technically challenged,

Commissioner. I think it's there. Can you put it on the screen? There we go. Can we make it bigger? How can we make it bigger? All right.

Good afternoon, commissioners. My name is Tony Pantaleoni with Kotas Pantaleoni Architecture. We're the project architects. I would like to walk through the project with you. The project is located at the corner of north west -- I'm sorry. The north west corner of Nordhoff and Stilling Street, and Nordhoff is to the left, a lesser slope, and Stillings is to the right. Okay? The proposed project is to subdivide the lot into four smaller lots.

This is an aerial view of the site. You see the house in the middle of the photograph there? The lot is about 7,346 square feet, and we're essentially surrounded by single-family homes.

Oh, thank you. If you can, that would be great.
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Take a look. This is looking at the house on the corner, 95 Nordhoff, and some of our neighbors surrounding us. It's Nordhoff Street to the left, and Stilling Street to the right. Stilling Street is a steeper street, and Nordhoff Street is a lesser slope. Not going anywhere.

This is looking at Nordhoff, our house, our property is between the pink home one on the left, and our existing home on the right.

This is Stilling Street. Our house is to the left, and there's a large redwood tree and open space behind our house, our property, and then the neighbors.

This is the existing site plan currently. The single-family home will be maintained, and there's a redwood tree right behind it, that we're also maintaining. We've had some various meetings with the neighborhood neighbors and, as you mentioned, is a previous historic presentation that you had, some of the neighbors felt that this was a historic property, and we had a historic resource evaluation done, and they didn't find that, but we're saving it, we're restoring it, and we're preserving it. Okay?

This is the proposed subdivision. So the
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2 modify it a little bit. It's a little bit too wide. There's a wrap around porch that needs to be removed on the side of it, and then the rear of it needs to be also reduced in size. So that lot, the reason we're here today is a conditional use application. The lot on the corner would be 24 feet wide, instead of the required 25 feet wide, and we have 1501 square feet, rather than the 1750 that we need.

The lot to the left, it will be a vacant
lot. We're not proposing to build on that at this time. We're proposing to sell it. And then the other two lots facing Nordhoff, those are what we're proposing to build also.

In terms of the condition use application, 89 Nordhoff, the lot at the bottom is only 24 feet wide, and it's code requires it to be 25 , and those are the conditional use requests.

This is a site plan for the house at the corner. Again, as I mentioned, we have to reduce the size somewhat. We're also proposing an addition at the rear. The tree, again, will remain, but by doing this again, we're allowed to have two lots facing Nordhoff for two new homes. Let's see here. Just one second.
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This is the plan for the existing house. It has a one-car garage, bedroom on the basement level, living, dining, and kitchen area on the first floor, and then three bedrooms on the second floor. Because of the roof slope of the existing, the front of the house, which we're maintaining, the bedroom is really tight. We're only allowed to put sort of one tight bedroom there and some closets to the side, but at the rear portion, you can see that where the existing part is remaining and the new to the left, allows us to have two new bedrooms back there.

This is the elevation of the house currently. We will be removing the asbestos siding, and replacing it with new horizontal siding, new windows, new trim, new garage door, so rehabilitating the entire house.

These again, are the elevations of the Nordhoff house 95, and then the two proposed houses next door.

I'm going. Yeah, here we go.

And then this is the rendering for the corner house 95 Nordhoff that we're preserving, and you see the raised portion at the back to get the extra height, but keeping it in character with the existing house.
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>> Mr. Pantaleoni, your time is up.
Commissioners may have questions for you.
>> Okay. Well, I am here to answer any questions you have.
$\gg$ Thank you very much. Okay. With that, we will take public comments on this item. I have a few speaker cards, Joshlyn Shelly, Larry Catalain, Jennifer Pullopshuck, Bashir Abdallah, Brian Freedman, Carolyn Flag, and David Pierce.

And if you want to speak on this item, and I didn't call your name, you can come up, just line up on the left side please. Okay. Someone has to come up first don't be shy.
>> My name is Larry Ketalar, and I own the property at 65 Nordhoff Street. I have been living there for about 40 years, and I knew the lady that passed away at 95 Nordhoff. The entire time $I$ have been there, of course, it's been a nice big open space. Everyone that $I$ know of at the end of the block always knew that there were actually two lots, if you go to the city there was 95, and I don't know what that 89, or whatever that was, and then there was 65. So we're not opposed to the development of this corner, when that Connie's house was sold, 95 Nordhoff, it was expected that somebody would develop
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that side lot. And I applaud the architects for what they have come up, what they've done, but my concern is, is that these -- I'm sorry for not being more articulate. What we would like to see, what I would like to see, is that, 95 and another house on the property, and not, you know, three skinny little houses that are much taller than all the other adjacent houses around there. I think the architects said that this -- the architectural plans were in keeping with the surrounding land, the architectural. And I disagree because the houses are very old. My house is over a hundred years old. And the house across the street, I think it's 89 Nordhoff is over a hundred years old. I think 69 Nordhoff, Mr. Bashir's house is probably around that age too. And we have large lots. I mean, that is one of the charms of living in this particular neighborhood is that we have deep backyards. We have -- not all of us have two lots, of course, but $I$ have a lot and a half, and two -- this kind of density, on that corner lot is -impacts the whole nature of the neighborhood. It just diminishes it. And I think that's it. That's my comment. Thank you.
>> Thank you very much. Next speaker
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>> Okay. Next speaker please.
>> Hi. I'm Carolyn Flag. I live -- I'm the other house that is directly across the street from this -- this lot that is being developed. And
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thank you for hearing us. Um, so I have a few concerns, and one is also about traffic that, um, this is one -- one street, long street, and people use it to cut through from Monterey down to Chenery as they do Congo Street, and it has recently gotten very bad. Well, a lot of discussion between
neighbors about it. And there was a lister next door, and there was a long discussion on there, and another one going on now about the same area. So my concern is about the increase in traffic, but also combined with the parking that's there because this will take away two, three, maybe, parking spots with the driveways coming out all on Nordhoff Street. The previous design had two driveways on Stillings, and just two on Nordhoff Street. And the other thing I'm
being there. I'm one of the newer neighbors being
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there, living there, I moved in in 2013, but most of the people who live on the street have lived there for generations.

Um, I also wanted to say that it was unfortunate the timing of the meeting. There are a lot of people who could not come because of working, and picking up kids, things like that, there were a lot of neighbors who wanted to speak, but were not able to today. So pretty much our whole block feels this way, and we're a pretty united block and a pretty friendly block. We don't want to keep people out, we just want it to still be a neighborhood. So thank you.
>> Thank you. Next speaker please.
>> I'm Jennifer Polishook. I live at 66 Nordhoff, across the street. And my house was built in 1906. It's similar to a lot of the houses. This project is different from the first one we heard at 915 Cayuga. This is not affordable housing. These are going to be $\$ 2$ million single-family homes.

There are concerns today, I heard being here all day, about the cannibalization of neighborhoods, and the importance of open space. And I think this project really echoes both of those. There is a double lot with one existing home in Glen Park, and
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the plans are to take this corner lot, and fill it with four large homes with no space in between. It will overshadow the neighborhood neighboring homes by four feet, increasing traffic in an already busy intersection, and removing green space.

Both Nordhoff and Stillings are one lane of traffic. People park on both sides, and so in the morning, at the commute time, you have people constantly having to back up, people needing to be directing traffic, and they only have one lane to work with, so it makes it for a narrow street. Personally, my car has been hit three times parking on the street. I have lived there almost 20 years.

This construction will take away three
street parkings, adding two garages, but also adding
only one-car garages, and adding two new families.
The density is not in harmony with Glen Park
neighborhood. I ask your consideration to maintain a
safe and scale, and narrow streets with family
residences. Thank you.
>> Thank you very much. Next speaker
please.
>> Good afternoon, commissioners. I'm
Bashir Abdallah, residing at 69 Nordhoff Street. I
am next to the proposed development of the property.
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current status of the houses that's are there now. I also think that -- and, previously, we already had concerns with proposals from the developer in regards to the tree, the redwood tree, it's now going to be moved to a separate stand alone lot, which he has proposed to sell. I don't know when he sells that, how he is going to be developed. You can't develop that lot without the tree being removed. And I think the tree is essential to the neighborhood. It provides shade and cooling for properties, and we have fought this battle before, and it looks like we're going to have to continue to fight this battle until we die because they're set on removing that tree, and it's just another way to get around that for this tree to be removed. I'm concerned with the quote substandard lot sizes. I don't think that is conducive to the neighborhood. And, again, I want to echo what they said about the traffic. Parking is already bad. This will acerbate the problem. With Lyft and Uber going through the neighborhoods, the traffic has increased substantially more, so in the past five years, if not more recently, and $I$ think that this -- the way the current proposal is, it's not conducive to the neighborhood.
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should be a balanced truck.
>> State your name for the record please.
>> I'm sorry?
>> State your name.
>> My name is Rohan Clark. I oppose
allowing the developer to subdivide the lot into four lots. This would create a far too dense living situation which is out of sink with the neighborhood, and exacerbate traffic jams throughout construction. Three lots would be better, and would still allow the developer massive profits of millions of dollars. Please reconsider this plan. I met with my neighbors, the consensus is that they all oppose subdivision of the lot into four new lots, and they oppose four story new homes that are out of character with the neighborhood.

More neighbors who oppose the developers request wanted to attend the hearing today, but couldn't because the hearing is in the middle of the workday. This stands to favor the developer. I can test the developer's submission that there are quote "No features of the project that could be detrimental of those residing in the area." Four new lots will definitely have an adverse impact on the neighborhood for years. Aren't three lots enough to make a huge
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profit?
As streets have become a major connection artery between 280 north and 280 south, and 101, and are very narrow to begin with, single-driving-car width, if you add construction vehicles for this much time, blocking these outlets, you're going to cause collisions and potential fatalities, and we won't be able to easily access our homes anymore.

Has the developer confirmed all three of the currently requested buildings, there could be four that will be built the same time rather than one after the after, drawing out the inconvenience for the neighbors and anyone traveling on these roads. This is an important question. Each new house would be a years' worth of construction, noise, and traffic, and parking problems. Our neighborhood is comprised of people who have been drawn to its peace and tranquility, and some have lived here for decades and generations, and this kind of development would destroy the neighborhood and remove a lot of green space. It isn't somber. Exhibit D, page 51, of the developers PDF, none of the new housing would be below market rate or affordable. None. Most likely, 3 million dollar houses, and one even has an elevator. And this isn't about allowing average
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people to buy new homes in the city, the developer's request is simply him trying to maximize his profit to an excessive level, making millions on each property and leaving. He won't have to live through years of construction for each new house or renovation, or the end result of such overly dense houses in this neighborhood. The proposal does not fit in with the character of the neighborhood at all. And, importantly, two of the three houses are not three-story buildings as mentioned before. They worded it as three-story, over-garage, obfuscating the reality of four-story buildings. And these are not common building types in the area, which is normally two stories. One of those, the garage level, the developer included 20 legislature [indiscernible], stating the developer team, who worked over the past, did satisfy all the neighbors as best as possible. Not true, they didn't reach out to my partner and I, and as far as I am aware, the surrounding neighbors. The signed names, the 20 submissions of letters, found almost all the retailers for Caldwell Bank or real estate, and two work for a title company or lender, and they're going to clearly support a developer. Only one of the 20 people lives in Glen Park. 19 letters are exactly
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whenever we can find a lot.
When I looked at the plans, and I'm not saying that in response, and not hearing you, I heard the neighbor's concerns, I take them very much into consideration, and speaking to what is in front of me, which did not include any of your comments, seeing that, actually, this project made me smile because there is a creativity to how this is resolved that made me feel that we're on the right track here.

The projects of the three buildings, the two buildings, which are composed, are code compliant. The minor lot adjustments that are really the subject of our decisions today are, I think, completely in keeping with of what our task really is.

The subdivision is a little bit more complicated due to the fact that previous commitments about the retention of the redwood tree drove the retention of the other home, which further on then, complicates a lot itself, is subdivided in a manner by which multiple buildings could comfortably sit on a very large corner parcel, emphasis on corner parcel. So I have to actually have to nod to Mr. Pantaleoni as this being a very creative and very harmonious solution.

I do also have to take staff's careful
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evaluation into consideration, which basically, does not leave one page unturned to look as to whether or not there are deficiencies or not. There are none. The staff believes that from code compliance to density, and architectural characteristics, the architect is compatible with the neighborhood, and further to that, it's a necessary and desirable project given the very difficult charge for us to support density and support sensitive infill, which, I believe, this project achieves.
>> Thank you. Commissioner Hillis.
>> So, I mean, I generally like that
there's new units coming on this lot, but can $I$ ask the architect a question, for a minute? I mean, I did a little -- this -- it is 7300 square feet, the lot?
>> Existing lot, yes.
>> Which if you do the math it's 25 by a hundred, is three lots, you have divided it into four. Why did you do that, first of all?
>> Well, because we're under the planning code, at a corner, we're allowed to reduce the size of the lots down to 1750 , within a 150 feet of the corner, 150 or 130, anyway, that gave us the opportunity for more density at the corner.
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>> Okay. And then the 4th, why weren't you proposing anything for the 4th lot? Is it the tree?
$\gg$ No. Our neighbor next door has property-line windows right on the property line, and we had a discussion with them about a year and a half ago about his possibly purchasing the project
property, so that maybe he could use it as a side yard, or develop it some day. So we decided to sort of put that on hold and focus on the other three parcels facing Nordhoff.
>> Okay. And then as far the height of the two buildings on Nordhoff, I mean, I know they're code compliant -- and I apologize to the neighbors -I do use Congo to cut through and get to Monterey, so I'm sorry, but it's actually given me the opportunity to see this neighborhood, which is lovely, but they are tall compared to -- I mean, I get the code, but it's tall. I mean, I don't think I have seen other four-story structures there, but maybe I just don't go the right route. Can you tell us about the context there?
>> Well, the lst floor is essentially a basement, so that it's dug into the ground, and there are stairs for them to come up out of the garage. And then there's three stories above it, and the
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| 1 | height limit is 35 feet, and it follows the contour |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | of the elevation because it slopes up. And that is |
| 3 | how we can get -- the uppermost floor is set back, I |
| 4 | think, 15 feet from the front facade. |
| 5 | >> Right. |
| 6 | >> So that will help eliminate the massing |
| 7 | of it from the street. |
| 8 | >> Okay. And how many square feet are the |
| 9 | two -- |
| 10 | >> Two new houses are approximately 1200 -- |
| 11 | sorry. 2600 square feet. |
| 12 | >> That is liveable, but gross. |
| 13 | >> Gross. |
| 14 | >> Right. I mean, you're not including the |
| 15 | garage in that are you? |
| 16 | >> I have that here. Total square footage |
| 17 | is 3,466, roughly. |
| 18 | >> That -- I would have loved to see four |
| 19 | smaller houses on this. I mean, it's Glen Park, you |
| 20 | know? You're fairly close to the BART station there, |
| 21 | you know, I can -- I think you're just doing too |
| 22 | much. You know, especially not knowing what is going |
| 23 | to happen with that 4th lot. You're, generally, |
| 24 | taller than most, your lots are smaller than most. I |
| 25 | get wanting to densify, but I would love to see four |
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2,000 square foot homes or, you know, 2200 square foot homes on all these lots than the two 3300, and I get it, you have gone underneath but, to me, it's just a little -- a little too much you're asking for in these with kind of not knowing what that 4 th parcel is going to be. And, again, I'm fine with four units here, but I think it would be -- I would have loved to fit two units in those two buildings, in the building two each, but it's one, but I think in that size, you can fit that in the footprint you have. I like a lot about that this project, but it's making me uneasy because it's too large. I don't know if you want to call them monster homes, but they're pretty big. And then one to come, I would imagine.
>> Thank you. Commissioner Richards.
>> So I'm in complete agreement with

Commissioner Hillis.
>> I looked at this, and the first thing I saw was the tree, and despite millions of dollars of trying to save the tree at 323 Cumberland, and we had an arborist come in and do a tree saving plan, they developed the lot, not only on 323 Cumberland, but the lot on Sanchez, and the tree is dead, and it was huge, it must have been 12 feet around. I think
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| >> Okay. |
| :---: |
| >> And the lots go all the way -- the |
| lots -- the lots -- you don't subdivide to four lots, |
| you subdivide to three. |
| >> Right. Reconfigured. Okay. We would |
| probably need a continuance. I don't think we can |
| really -- |
| >> Second. |
| >> We're going to -- as the -- did |
| Commissioner Johnson -- did you want to say |
| something? |
| >> Yeah. I just want to make sure, in that |
| direction, there's also a direction to explore two |
| units in each of the buildings? |
| >> Yeah, that's what the motion -- |
| >> That's in there. |
| >> Okay. |
| >> Yeah. It's an ADU. |
| >> It has to be because it's RH-1. |
| >> They could go up to 1200 square feet, I |
| think, by state law. Commissioner Moore? |
| >> What is in front -- what is in front of |
| this commission is a subdivision only. That is |
| basically the issue. I think that I have to rely on |
| Mr. Washington, but in this, it will open as a whole |
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other can of worms because I have a hard time giving the concerns the public has, or the neighbors have with density that adding three ADUs here, in any other neighborhood would be desirable, I think would exactly strike the wrong tone because now you're adding instead of, like, one living unit, you're adding, basically, two, which did increase the potential number of cars, which increases a significant number of people.

So I have to defer to you, what is in front of this commission is only the issue of subdivision. We're an RH-1, as to whether or not they're are creative solutions to adding ADUs. I don't know, and it will also not deal with the lot width because it will not make the lot wider, it will then only make them long, which is not exactly what the community is addressing here.
>> Mr. Washington. Yes. Go ahead.
>> It's triggering the conditional use authorization. So that aspect -- if that has changed because you no longer want to have that 4th parcel subdivided abutting the neighbor, that would have to removed. In essence, it would come back to more as a standard 311 notification, which could be DRed back to the commission, and we would be giving them
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direction if they withdrew if they took -- withdrew this conditional organization.
>> Could you speak in the microphone?
>> It would be still be back through notification of 311, and that could potentially be a DR.
>> Yeah. If I can clarify. So the conditional use authorization is brought forth to you. Because it's a combination with single-family homes. So, in this case, the two substandard lots that are being presented, are the ones that are being developed with the single-family homes, and that is triggering the conditional use authorization. And if the subdivide, the lot, had come in with confirming lots, or just single-family homes, the only way you guy would see that project is if it was DR, it would just be a standard 311 notification at that point.
>> Commissioner Hillis?
$\gg$ So to follow up on that though, if you took on the Nordhoff Street frontage, and tried to divided it into three lots, whether you had the 4th lot in the back or not, you would still have two substandard lots; right? Because you can't get the 25 foot; is that not true?
>> We would have three standards lots
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| 1 | eliminate that 4th lot. |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | >> Gentlemen, can you put the site plan up? |
| 3 | >> SF GOV, can you go to the computer |
| 4 | please? |
| 5 | >> You would want two ADUs in those new |
| 6 | structures, and eliminate the 4th lot? |
| 7 | >> Yeah. I mean, if possible. |
| 8 | >> Or we can have three-single family -- |
| 9 | >> Yes, go ahead, Commissioner Richards. |
| 0 | >> Or we can have three-single-family |
| 1 | homes, that are on regular conforming lots, and they |
| 2 | can put an ADU in them if they want. |
| 3 | Here we talked about biodiversity an hour |
| 14 | ago, and we got this big redwood tree that we know |
| 5 | damn well is going to go away if that lot is |
| 6 | developed. |
| 7 | >> Not if we have -- |
| 8 | >> I don't believe you. I am sorry. I |
| 9 | don't believe you. |
| 20 | >> Commissioner Moore. |
| 1 | >> To me, conforming lots, we don't have |
| 22 | the lineal lanes along Nordhoff -- |
| 23 | >> Correct. |
| 24 | >> -- in order to create three 25 foot |
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decision being made at this hearing, I think in this particular case, because of the comments raised by the neighbors, the distinctive design elements that are associated with this parcels and this property, it might be best for the project sponsor if we did a continuation, they could go back to the drawing board
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and address some of the concerns raised by the neighbors, and determine if it's in their best interest to either keep the active CEU, or if not
withdraw it, come back, they have heard direct
comment from our commission. And, if necessary, they
may have to come back, and it may eliminate the need
for a CEU, and they go for the normal 311
notification. I'm very confident there is a design
out for this property, one that will meet the project
sponsor needs, and also address the concerns raised
by the neighbors.
>> Okay. Commissioner Moore.
>> I would ask the city attorney, does this
fall under housing accountability discussion?
$\gg$ No.
>> President Melgar, Kate Stacey, we would
have to look at this issue when the continuance
occurs. There is a modification from the code
requirements here, and we would look at that and see
what the standards of the code would be. We can look
at that during the continuance.
>> Thank you.
>> Okay.
>> Mr. Pantaleoni, giving the direction
from the commission how many time do you think you
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| 1 | suggesting is that we take down the bulk a little bit |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | to, you know -- and in that, so I think that in |
| 3 | between all of those things, that we're giving you a |
| 4 | direction to explore different design. I just want |
| 5 | you -- to point out that we haven't voted on this. |
| 6 | So to be given a clear direction is difficult when we |
| 7 | don't have a consensus. Okay. |
| 8 | >> Commissioners, there is a motion that |
| 9 | has been seconded to continue this matter to May 23rd |
| 0 | with some sort of direction from the commission. |
| 1 | >> On that motion, Commissioner Hillis? |
| 2 | > I. |
| 3 | >> Commissioner Johnson? |
| 4 | >> I. |
| 15 | >> Commissioner Moore? |
| 6 | >> I don't know what we're saying, so I |
| 7 | will just say I. |
| 8 | >> Continuing it. |
| 9 | >> We're continuing it. |
| 0 | >> Just continuing it? |
| 21 | >> Yeah. |
| 22 | >> Okay. I will continue it. Thank you. |
| 23 | Yes. |
| 24 | >> I. |
|  |  |
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| ```proposed 2:17 3:9 \(4: 18,235: 176: 25\) 8:18 14:25 16:6 38:15 proposing 7:11,12,14,21 24:2 provide 4:15,19 provides 16:10 public 4:4 9:6 21:16,18 29:2 Pullopshuck 9:8 purchasing 24:6 pursuant 3:10 putting 31:14 \begin{tabular}{c} \hline Question \(17: 14 \quad 19: 14\) \end{tabular} question 17:14 19:14 23:14 33:6 34:23 questions 5:3 9:2,4 quote 16:16 18:21 R raised \(4: 68: 23 \quad 15: 2\) \(17: 8 \quad 35: 21 \quad 36: 1,10\) rate \(19: 23\) rather \(7: 919: 11 \quad 31: 12\) \(38: 17\) reach \(20: 18\) reached \(3: 20,23\) real \(20: 22\) reality \(20: 12\) really \(8: 6 \quad 13: 24 \quad 17: 14\) \(21: 21 \quad 22: 12,14 \quad 28: 7\) \(34: 1637: 21 \quad 38: 10\) rear \(7: 4,22 \quad 8: 9\) reason \(7: 5\) reasons \(4: 9\) received \(4: 1,3 \quad 21: 21\) recently \(12: 516: 23\) recommends \(4: 7\) Reconfigured \(28: 5\) reconsider \(15: 16 \quad 18: 12\)``` | ```record 18:2 recorded 41:7,11 RECORDING 1:10 reduce 7:20 23:22 reduced 7:5 redwood 3:15,22 6:11,16 16:4 17:12 22:17 32:14 regards 3:14 16:4 regular 32:11 rehabilitating 8:15 related 11:16 41:13 rely 28:24 remain 2:19 7:22 17:12 27:23 remaining 8:10 removal 3:15 remove 4:25 19:20 removed 7:3 16:9,15 29:23 removing 8:13 14:5 16:14 rendering 8:21 renovation 20:6 rent-controlled 4:25 replacing 8:14 REPORTED 1:21 Reporter 41:5,20 REPORTER'S 1:10 request 2:2,11 3:11,18 18:18 20:2 requested 19:10 requests 7:18 required 3:1 7:8 requirements 4:13 36:19 requires 7:17 residences 14:20 residential 4:23,24 residing 14:24 18:23``` | ```resolved 22:8 resource 6:21 response 22:3 responsibility 21:24 responsive 38:23 rest 15:9 restoring 6:23 result 20:6 retailers 20:22 retention 22:17,18 revert 11:18 review 3:11,13,17,19 RH-1 2:22 4:20 28:19 29:12 Richards 26:16 27:10 31:25 32:9 33:16 35:9 37:16 38:9 39:25 Riverside 41:2,5,21 roads 19:13 Rohan 18:5 roof 8:5 roughly 25:17 route 24:20 run 31:10 S safe 14:19 SAN 1:1,2 2:1 Sanchez 26:24 satisfy 4:6 20:17 save 26:21 saved 27:7 saving 6:23 26:22 saw 26:20 scale 14:19 screen 5:8 second 7:25 8:4 21:3 27:15 28:8 seconded 39:9``` |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |



| ```subdivided 22:19 29:22 subdividing 37:18 subdivision 2:3,12 3:2 6:25 15:11 18:14 22:15 28:23 29:11 33:6,17 37:21 subject 3:5,9,16,23 4:25 22:12 submission 18:21 submissions 20:21 submit 21:9,12,14 submitted 3:12 subscribe 41:15 substandard 2:15 3:3 16:16 30:10,23 35:8,10 38:2 substantially 16:22 suburban 17:9 suggesting 39:1 supervision 41:9 support 4:3,4 20:24 21:4 23:9 33:23 34:13 35:19 supportive 37:17 sure 28:12 surrounded 5:23 surrounding 6:3 10:10 20:20 \\ talk 37:22 \\ talked 32:13 \\ talking 31:5 \\ tall 24:17,18 \\ taller 10:7 25:24 \\ task 22:14 \\ team 20:16 \\ technically 5:6 \\ tenants 4:25 \\ terms 7:15 15:11 38:24``` | ```test 18:21 thank 5:4,24 9:5 10:23,24 12:1 13:13,14 14:20,21 15:19,20 17:4,5,21,22 21:5,11,16 23:11 26:16 36:22 39:22 that's 10:22 12:11 16:1 28:15,16 33:13,15 35:11 thereof 41:14 there's 6:11,16 7:3 23:13 24:25 28:13 they're 16:13 20:23 24:12 26:14 29:12 31:11,24 34:7 35:7 they've 10:2 third 4:17 three-single 32:8 three-single-family 32:10 three-story 20:10,11 throughout 18:9 THURSDAY 1:11 tight 8:7 title 20:23 today 7:6 13:9,21 18:18 22:13 tone 29:5 Tony 5:11 total 2:18 25:16 track 22:9 traffic 11:14,16 12:2,10 14:4,7,10 15:3,12,13 16:19,21 18:9 19:16 tranquility 19:18 transcribed 41:8 transcript 1:10 41:10 traveling 19:13 tree 3:16,22 6:11,16 7:22 16:4,8,9,14,15``` | ```17:12 22:17 24:2 26:20,21,22,24 27:6 32:14 tried 30:20 35:1 triggering 29:19 30:13 trim 8:15 troubling 34:10 truck 18:1 true 20:18 30:24 41:10 trying 20:2 26:21 types 20:13 typewriting 41:8 \begin{tabular}{l} \hline U \\ Uber \(16: 20\) \\ Ultimately \(3: 20\) \\ um 12:1,2 \(13: 4\) 15:18 \\ unanimously \(40: 6\) \\ underneath \(26: 3\) \\ under-utilized \(4: 15\) \\ uneasy \(26: 12\) \\ unfortunate \(13: 5\) \\ unit \(4: 1729: 6\) \\ united \(13: 10\) \\ units \(2: 143: 22 \quad 4: 16\) \\ \(23: 1326: 7,8 \quad 27: 2,7\) \\ \(28: 1431: 9,15\) \\ \(38: 11,15\) \\ unturned \(23: 2\) \\ Upon \(3: 17\) \\ uppermost \(25: 3\) \\ urging \(11: 17\) \\ \hline \end{tabular}``` |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |


| ```VIDEO 1:10 view 5:20 voted 38:19 39:5 votes 27:11 W walk 5:12 Washington 28:25 29:18 35:17 37:12 wasn't 37:21 weight 11:9 welcome 15:19 we're 5:12,22 6:16,22,23 7:6,11,12,13,21,23 8:6,7,22 9:23 11:17 13:10 16:12 22:9 23:21,22 27:3 28:9 29:12 35:11 39:3,16,19 west 2:21 5:14,15 We've 6:17 whatever 9:22 whenever 22:1 WHEREOF 41:15 whether 23:2 29:12 30:21 whole 10:21 13:9 28:25 wide 7:2,7,8,17 wider 29:15 width 19:5 29:14 33:3 windows 8:15 12:17,19,23 24:4 wish 17:16 withdraw 34:20 36:4 withdrew 30:1 WITNESS 41:15 worded 20:11 wording 21:1 work 14:11 20:23``` | workday 18:20 <br> worked 11:7 20:17 <br> working 13:6 <br> worms 29:1 <br> worth 19:15 <br> wrap 7:3 <br> wrong 29:5 33:2 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |

