



Supplemental Memorandum

To: Planning Commission Secretary (commissions.secretary@sfgov.org)
Mr. Jeffrey Horn, Senior Planner (jeffrey.horn@sfgov.org)

Re: November 19 Hearing, Record No. 2019-0138088CUAVAR;
Project Address: 4300 17th St.

From: Corbett Heights Neighbors, a Neighborhood Association¹

Date: November 16, 2020

Corbett Heights Neighbors (“CHN”) files this supplemental memorandum in the above captioned matter following release on Friday November 13 of the Executive Summary, Conditional Use/Variance report of Planning Commission staff and our review of it (hereafter, “Executive Summary.”) We previously filed a Memorandum in Opposition dated November 10 which is already a matter of public record and, indeed, is attached to the aforementioned Executive Summary. We will not repeat our prior arguments but wish to make the following supplementary points:

1. Outreach. Apparently repeating unverified representations from the Project Sponsor, Staff states on page 2 of the Executive Summary that “The Sponsor presented the Project to the Corbett Heights Neighbors on October 26, 2020.” An identical statement is made on page 3, paragraph 5 of the Planning Commission Draft Motion. These statements are categorically false if by “Corbett Heights Neighbors” the drafters mean our association. At no time has the Sponsor “presented the Project” to the association, and we are mystified by the claim as well as the odd precision of the date. Given that (a) the Project was first proposed in November 2019; (b) Staff’s Plan Check Letter of April 27, 2020 objected to the Project as then proposed; yet (c) the Project was never modified in any material way, CHN saw no particular reason to engage in what would obviously have been a fruitless exercise because we look first to the Planning Commission staff for guidance. The fact that the Project now before the Commission is precisely the

¹ Bill Holtzman, President; Paul Allen, Secretary. P.O Box 14493, SF CA 94114.

same as the one proposed more than a year ago and rejected by Staff seven months ago confirms the prudence of our position.

2. Opposition. In its summary, Staff states that “The opposition to the Project is centered on the projects [sic] non-compliance with the Planning Code and the Corona Heights Large Residence Special Use District.” Executive Summary, p. 2. Speaking only as CHN, this is certainly correct as far as it goes. However, given that the Project’s “main purpose” has undergone a metamorphosis from one described in November 2019 as twofold — build the applicant’s home and develop affordable housing² — to one now promoted as solely the latter³, we must reiterate what we wrote at length in our principal Memorandum in Opposition: (a) CHN does not oppose ADUs in its neighborhood; (b) as Staff has noted and indeed recommended, the two proposed ADUs can be accommodated on the existing property without a lot split and subsequent construction of a 5,000 square foot apartment building that would be to the detriment of neighbors and the neighborhood; and (c) if policy makers or advocates determine that ADUs should be more easily accommodated in an RH-2 zone or elsewhere, there should be a proper *a priori* fact finding, analytic, and deliberative process, led by the Planning Department, and the development of appropriate criteria and standards to do so, applied uniformly; rather than as here via an ad hoc, block by block approach that requires more than a handful of variances and conditional use authorizations. The Project is promoted as a “blueprint” for adding ADUs but we respectfully suggest that sensible city wide “blueprints” should be a bit more carefully and logically drafted, not based upon the whim of a single Project sponsor.
3. CHN Supports the Staff’s Recommendation. The Staff’s Executive Summary released Friday November 13 is, of course, a far more detailed, cogent, and persuasive set of objections to this Project than set forth in its April 27 Plan Check Letter. Our November 10 Memorandum in Opposition necessarily relied on the latter. We think the latest Executive Summary speaks for itself so we will not belabor the matter further other than to declare that we endorse Staff’s conclusions and urge the Commission to reject this Project for the reasons stated therein as well as in our memoranda in opposition.

² Pre-Application Meeting Packet, November 2, 2019.

³ See the Sponsor’s Brief, Attachment in Support of Entitlement Application at p. 3. With ADU square footage at approximately 16% of the Project, one could fairly question the veracity of the “main purpose” claim.