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SFMOMA (MUSEUM OF MODERN ART) EXPANSION

Design: Snøhetta
Size: 230,000 square feet
Budget: $555 million
Opening: Early 2016

images courtesy of Snøhetta
350 MISSION

Project Sponsor: GLL Real Estate Partners

Description: This LEED Platinum building proposes to have 340,000 square feet of office space, 1,000 square feet of retail space, 23,500 square feet of subterranean parking area, and approximately 12,700 square feet of publicly-accessible interior open space.

Project Site Size: 18,909 square feet
100 VAN NESS REDesign

Project Sponsor: Emerald Fund

Description: Up to 400 studio, one-bedroom, and two-bedroom residential rental units and over 6,800 square feet of ground floor retail space

Project Site Size: 15,500 square feet, 29 stories
On behalf of the Planning Commission, I am pleased to present the Planning Department’s 2011-12 annual report.

The Planning Commission has been working closely with staff in managing the city's continuous growth and changes. In this past fiscal year, the Commission reviewed a number of projects that will significantly impact our neighborhoods and our city's skyline, from the Transit Center District Plan, to the America's Cup environmental impact report, and the Central Corridor plan.

In an effort to manage and maintain the extensive Planning Code, the commission also reviewed over 50 pieces of legislation. Most notably, after extensive work by staff and members of both the Planning and Historic Preservation Commissions, Articles 10 and 11 addressing the city's preservation program, were revised. In addition, in our attempt to simplify the code and ease burdens on small businesses, major changes to restaurant controls were adopted unanimously by the Board. Our work includes the review of projects ranging from high-rises to roof decks, and we continue to look for ways to improve our reviews and the projects that get built.

I would like to thank my fellow Commissioners for their dedication to our work, and their continued passion for the city. And my thanks also to Mayor Lee and the Board of Supervisors for their continued support of the Department and the Commissions. And a special thanks to staff for their excellent work.

We look forward to another year of continued success.
Message from the
Historic Preservation
Commission President

This year, the Historic Preservation Commission made significant progress in its work to protect the significant architectural heritage of San Francisco. Perhaps most significantly, Articles 10 and 11 of the Planning Code were amended to recognize the role of the Commission and bring the city’s preservation practices up to date. The Commission and staff spent countless hours and numerous public hearings on this important effort.

The Commission and staff also made significant progress in the Landmark Designation Work Program, which established priorities for designation of important city landmarks. The Commission recommended approval of the city’s first historic district since Dogpatch was approved in 2003. When we adopted the Market Street Masonry District, a collection of significant brick and stone apartment buildings on Upper Market. The Commission also approved the designation of Sam Jordan’s Bar in the Bayview, strongly supported by his family and the neighborhood. Mr. Jordan was the first African American to run for mayor of San Francisco, and his bar was, and is, an important neighborhood gathering place.

Building on these successes, preservation staff also received the California Preservation Foundation Preservation Design Award for their work on the San Francisco Modern Architecture and Landscape Design Historic Context Statement, and two grants from the California Office of Historic Preservation.

It has been my great honor to serve as the President of the Historic Preservation Commission during these early years of the Commission. While preservation is often a challenging issue in a growing city, we play a critical role in ensuring that San Francisco grows with grace. Thanks to the excellent work of the Commission and staff, the city has a strong foundation for this work for years to come.

Charles Chase
President,
Historic Preservation Commission
Greetings,

With the economic growth that San Francisco has seen this year, the Planning Department has again geared up for increased activity. The current development activity allows the City to see the results of ten years of planning efforts.

We are implementing plans adopted for the Market Octavia area, to the Eastern Neighborhoods and Balboa Park; today we’re seeing the results of those efforts. We now know where growth should go and how it should happen, and it’s made a real difference. We are implementing design guidelines, environmental mitigation, and much improved procedures via Preliminary Plan Assessments (PPAs). The results are projects that create better neighborhoods, with less impact and better design.

San Francisco has seen the results of such plans in the past, with nearly 30 years of implementation of the 1985 Downtown Plan. That plan has helped to create one of the most vibrant urban centers in the US and is a model for cities across the country.

The Department’s work continues to be guided by the exceptionally committed members of the Planning Commission and Historic Preservation Commission. These commissioners spent countless hours on behalf of the city, and their dedication shows. I am grateful to each of them for their work and their guidance.

Of course none of this is possible without the best planning staff anywhere. The staff of this department is dedicated, intelligent and passionate. Your work is difficult and conflict-ridden, but there is little doubt that you always have the best interests of the city at heart. The city owes all of you a debt of gratitude.

San Francisco is a city we all love to love, and for good reason. While our work as planners is challenging in such a love-fest, we do it because we know we achieve results. And the results are in: Great Planning creates Great Cities.

My best,
“Projects like the Better Market Street and parklets that generate a lot of enthusiasm in how we use and perceive space around us. It’s inspiring to be a part of that change.”

- David Winslow, staff architect
Organizational Overview

The San Francisco Planning Department, under the direction of the Planning Commission, shapes the future of San Francisco by:

- generating an extraordinary vision in the General Plan and neighborhood plans;
- fostering exemplary design;
- improving the environment;
- enhancing the distinct character, culture and history of our neighborhoods and people; and
- embracing our regional role and responsibility.

As described in the City Charter, the Planning Commission is responsible for the city’s General Plan and guides the overall direction of the department. The Historic Preservation Commission advises the City on historic and cultural resources within our city.

The department serves a broad range of constituents, including the citizens of San Francisco, community organizations, elected and appointed policymakers, builders, architects, property owners, tenants, and advocacy groups. All rely on the City's General Plan and the Planning Code to achieve the City's development goals.
The Planning Department’s principal activities are:

- Developing and maintaining the City’s General Plan
- Formulating planning controls, standards and guidelines that ensure the highest quality development
- Analyzing development proposals for their environmental effects and developing implementation and monitoring measures to reduce impacts
- Reviewing development proposals to ensure compliance with the General Plan, the Planning Code and environmental analysis evaluations
- Engaging the public to inform, consult, or seek input on plans and projects and to involve the public in an ongoing dialogue about the future of the city
- Serving as a data analysis and information center to gather, analyze, interpret and disseminate data in support of land-use policy analysis
- Analyzing development trends to help the City understand changes to the City’s housing stock and commercial uses
- Coordinating with sister agencies on application of the General Plan and fulfillment of community planning efforts as needed
- Implementing the Planning Code and applying the Administrative Code to permit applications
Governance

Planning Commission

The Planning Commission consists of seven members appointed by the Mayor and the President of the Board of Supervisors to help plan for growth and development in San Francisco. Four members are appointed by the Mayor, while the other three members are appointed by the President of the Board of Supervisors. The Commission advises the Mayor, City Council and City departments on San Francisco’s long-range goals, policies and programs on a broad array of issues related to land use, transportation, and neighborhood planning. The Commission additionally has the specific responsibility for the stewardship and maintenance of the San Francisco’s General Plan. SF Planning reports to the Planning Commission through the Planning Director.

2011-2012 PLANNING COMMISSION ROSTER

1 Rodney Fong
2 Cindy Wu
3 Michael Antonini
4 Gwyneth Borden
5 Ron Miguel
6 Kathrin Moore
7 Christina Olague (until December 2011)
8 Hisashi Sugaya
Historic Preservation Commission

The Historic Preservation Commission is a seven-member body that advises the Mayor, the Board of Supervisors and City departments on San Francisco’s historic preservation goals, policies and programs. All members are nominated by the Mayor and subject to the approval of the Board of Supervisors. The Commission's Architectural Review Committee provides advice to applicants and the department on complex historic preservation design issues.

The Commission also reviews proposed alternations to local landmarks and landmark districts. They also recommend buildings and places that are historically or culturally significant to the heritage of San Francisco for designation by the Board of Supervisors.

2011-2012 HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION ROSTER

1 Charles Chase President
2 Courtney Damkroger Vice-President
3 Karl Hasz
4 Richard Johns
5 Alan Martinez
6 Diane Matsuda
7 Andrew Wolfram
Department Organization

Management

SENIOR MANAGERS

1. John Rahaim, Planning Director
2. Kelley Amdur, Director of Current Planning (until June 2012)
3. Linda Avery-Herbert, Commissions Secretary
4. Jose Campos, Director of Citywide Planning
5. Thomas DiSanto, Chief Administrative Officer
6. Alicia John-Baptiste, Chief of Staff
7. Scott Sanchez, Zoning Administrator
8. Bill Wycko, Environmental Planning Officer

Divisions

Administration: The Administration division provides support and resources to realize departmental goals. This division includes finance, legislative affairs, communications, information technology, operations, and human resources.

Current Planning: The Current Planning section is responsible for reviewing project applications, implementing the historic preservation program and operating the Public Information Center. Every year, this division reviews and processes over 6000 building permits and several hundred case applications.

Citywide Planning: The Citywide Planning division develops policy, maintains and oversees compliance with the City’s General Plan, prepares and implements community plans, and acts as the urban design resource for the city. This division also gathers and analyzes data in support of land-use policy.

Environmental Planning: The Environmental Planning Division of the Planning Department reviews projects for potential environmental impacts on the City of San Francisco and its residents, a process known as environmental review.

Zoning and Compliance: This group promotes compliance with the Planning Code helps the public to understand the Planning Code, and initiates enforcement actions to remedy Planning Code violations. The Department investigates and resolves complaints about Planning Code violations.
THIS YEAR’S ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Project Highlights from 2011-2012
2011/2012 Project Highlights

Environmental Impact Reports (EIRs)

A 706 Mission Street – The Mexican Museum and Residential Tower Project
B 1601 Larkin Street Housing Project
C 800 Presidio Avenue
D 8 Washington Street/Seawall Lot 351 Project
E Beach Chalet Athletic Fields
F Chinese Hospital
G North Beach Public Library and Joe DiMaggio Playground
H SF Museum of Modern Art
I Western SoMa

see full list of Published EIRs P.33
Transit Center District Plan

The department led the five-year long effort to create the Transit Center District Plan in partnership with the Transbay Joint Powers Authority and the Successor Agency to the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency. The Plan is a comprehensive planning effort for the area of downtown around the new Transbay Transit Center. The Plan builds on the City’s 1985 Downtown Plan that envisioned the area around the former Transbay Terminal as the heart of the new downtown.

The new district will feature more than six million square feet of new office space, 4,000 new housing units (of which at least 1,200 units will be designated as affordable housing), up to 1,000 new hotel rooms, and improved streets to enhance transit service and support walking and bicycling. The new Plan also proposes to create and fund more than 11 acres of new parks, plazas and living streets, plus an additional $18 million for open space improvements outside of the Plan Area. Furthermore, between now and 2035, the project anticipates more than 27,000 new permanent jobs in the District.

One of the key objectives of the Transit Center District Plan is to raise revenue from new development for the Transit Center/Downtown Rail Extension project and other public infrastructure to support continued growth in the Plan area, including circulation, streetscape, open space, and other transit improvements. The Plan’s Funding Program is projected to raise $590 million of new revenue from development, including more than $400 million for completing the Transit Center/Downtown Rail Extension project.

As part of the project, the department completed the extensive environmental impact report which analyzed potential environmental effects associated with the Transit Center District Plan at a programmatic level, and analyzed impacts of the Transit Tower at a more refined, project-specific level.

Complementary to the plan, the Historic Preservation Commission unanimously approved the initiation and recommendation to the Board of Supervisors to expand the existing New Montgomery - 2nd Street Conservation District as part of the Transit Center District Plan, the first time a Conservation District has been expanded since the adoption of the Downtown Plan in the mid-1980s. As part of its actions, the commission added three properties to its landmark designation work program. It also recommended approval of the reclassification of forty-three properties as ‘significant’ or ‘contributory’ under Article 11 of the Planning Code, allowing property owners to participate in the Transferable Development Rights (TDR) program.

The environmental impact report was certified and the plan was adopted by the Planning Commission on May 24, 2012.

On July 31, the Board of Supervisors unanimously upheld the certification for the report and approved the plan.

For more information on the Transit Center District Plan, visit: http://transitcenter.sfplanning.org
### Transit Center District Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>sf. office space</th>
<th>6,000,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>new housing units</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>projected new jobs</td>
<td>27,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>open space funding</td>
<td>$18M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>new parks, plazas, living streets</td>
<td>11 ACRES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% affordable housing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
34th America’s Cup and James R. Herman Cruise Terminal and Northeast Wharf Plaza, Environmental Impact Review

The department successfully completed the comprehensive environmental impact report for the 34th America’s Cup and James R. Herman Cruise Terminal and Northeast Wharf Plaza.

Venues proposed for the events are piers, water areas, and facilities managed by the Port of San Francisco. Various other venues are proposed for spectator related activities, some of which are under the jurisdiction of other city, state or federal agencies, including Marina Green, Fort Mason, Aquatic Park, Alcatraz Island, Fort Baker Pier at Cavallo Point (near Sausalito), SF Civic Center, Union Square, and Justin Herman Plaza.

The Port proposed the development of Pier 27 as the James R. Herman Cruise Terminal and Northeast Wharf Plaza, which would be phased to allow America's Cup Village uses at Piers 27-29, including an initial phase of the cruise terminal building for the 2013 races. The Cruise Terminal project would involve demolition of the existing Pier 27 shed, a portion of the Pier 29 shed, and Pier 27 Annex Building. Proposed improvements to complete the cruise terminal and wharf plaza would be built out after the races are concluded. The cruise terminal would also accommodate other uses between ship calls, such as public or private gatherings, and maritime-oriented events. The Northeast Wharf Plaza would provide a 2½-acre open space at the south end of Pier 27, fronting along The Embarcadero promenade including a multi-use recreational space and ancillary structures for commercial and recreational services.

The America’s Cup World Series races are scheduled from August 21-26 and October 2-7, 2012. The Louis Vuitton Cup, the America’s Cup Challenger Series, will be held from July 4 – September 1, 2013 and the America’s Cup Finals will be held September 7-22, 2013. The highly-publicized international event has been designed to be seen from land -- a first in its 160-year history.

The 34th America’s Cup & James R. Herman Cruise Terminal and Northeast Wharf Plaza draft environmental impact report was published July 2011, with the final report certified by the Planning Commission in December 2011. The Board of Supervisors unanimously upheld the certification in January 2012.

To read the full America’s Cup Draft EIR, visit: http://environmental.sfplanning.org
Central Corridor Area Plan

The Central Corridor Area plan proposes to develop an integrated community vision for the southern portion of the Central Subway rail corridor, located in the vicinity of 4th Street between Townsend and Market Streets.

It also recommends changes to the allowed land uses and building heights, and includes a strategy for improving the pedestrian experience in this area. Changes to land use patterns are proposed along the southern segment of this corridor in SoMa to link transit to supportive land uses, capitalize on the growing demand for technology, digital media and other workspaces, improve the pedestrian experience of the area, and maintain the diversity that is key to SoMa’s success.

While the plan’s proposals are still being refined, the plan could add as many as 30,000 new jobs and 6,000 housing units, improve street conditions across all of the major corridors in the plan area, and expand open space opportunities with new living alleys and a potential new park.

Outreach for the Central Corridor planning process spanned the spring and summer of 2011. Staff met with over 15 community groups, hosted a series of walking tours, held a week-long charrette, and conducted a community survey.

The preliminary plan was released in June 2012, and is now under environmental review. The final plan and EIR are expected to be complete in late 2014.

For more info on the Central Corridor Area Plan, visit: http://centralcorridor.sfplanning.org
Central Corridor Area Plan

new housing units
6,000

projected new jobs
30,000
Officially launched in April 2011, the Property Information Map gives the general public access to a wealth of property information simply by entering an address.

This resource pulls current data from a dozen city departments, listing basic information about a property such as recent permit activity. The database includes: parcel information, permit history, maps, zoning, height limitations, special uses, historic designation, architectural information, assessor’s tax records, land value, last sale prices, related Planning Commission documents, complaints, and appeals.

Currently averaging 1,500 unique visitors a day, the site is widely used by department staff, staff of other City departments, realtors and the general public to:

- Find background information about any property in the city;
- Evaluate and monitor permits, projects or enforcement complaints;
- Access a wide range of scanned documents including Planning Commission resolutions, case documents, Historic Resource Evaluation reports, Categorical Exemption documents, historic and cultural resource survey forms; and
- Realtors and the general public use the site to evaluate properties prior to buying or renting.

The Property Information Map is available here: http://propertymap.sfplanning.org
Restaurant Legislation

In an effort to cut the red tape and simplify the process in opening an eating establishment in SF, the department successfully proposed new legislation to amend the Planning Code, reducing the number of restaurant definitions from 13 to 3.

There are now three eating and drinking use categories in the Planning Code; Limited-Restaurant, Restaurant and Bar. All other eating and drinking uses have been deleted from the Code.

The new uses are defined by its liquor license:

- Limited-Restaurants are not allowed to have on-site alcohol consumption, but may provide off-site beer or wine sales for consumption off the premises.
- Restaurants may provide on-site beer, wine, or liquor sales for drinking on the premises
- A bar is permitted to have on site alcohol consumption without being categorized as a Bona Fide Eating Place.

The new legislation also added 703.5, which establishes performance measures that apply to all eating and drinking uses whether principally permitted or conditionally permitted. These performance measures are modeled after our standardized conditions of approval for eating and drinking uses, such as limits on noise, smell and trash. As a consequence, most districts permit Limited-Restaurants as of right.

For more information, visit: http://www.sf-planning.org/index.aspx?page=2925
Significant changes were made to Articles 10 and 11 of the Planning Code, legislation which governs locally designated landmarks and landmark districts.

The amendments were adopted by the Board of Supervisors after 25 public hearings before the Historic Preservation Commission and the Planning Commission. The amendments codify the requirements of City Charter Section 4.135, which outlines the role and responsibilities of the Historic Preservation Commission. The amendments also provide clarification on noticing requirements; the landmark designation process; and Certificate of Appropriateness (Article 10) and Permit to Alter (Article 11) review.

The Historic Preservation Commission also delegated the review and approval of Administrative Certificates of Appropriateness in Article 10 and Minor Permits to Alter in Article 11 Conservation Districts to the department. The delegation allows the commission to focus on larger, more complex projects, as well as pressing policy issues.

This change also expedites the review of routine permit applications that meet the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards, saving applicants time and money.

The success of this delegation has led the Historic Preservation Commission to consider expansion of the delegated scopes of work in the upcoming year.

For more info on the Landmark Designation Work Program: [http://landmarks.sfplanning.org](http://landmarks.sfplanning.org)
Transportation Sustainability Program

The department is leading the implementation of the Transportation Sustainability Program (TSP), a program created to better support the City’s longstanding Transit First policy by modifying the City’s practices relative to development review.

The TSP plans to achieve this through the following two initiatives:

- Changing how we evaluate the effects of new development on the transportation system - emphasizing all modes of transportation - under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA); and
- Establishing a citywide Transportation Sustainability Fee (TSF) to offset the cumulative impacts of projects on the City’s transportation network.

These initiatives ensure that development review practices are consistent with the City’s policies and priorities, and that a development’s impact on San Francisco’s transportation system is fully offset through system improvements.

The TSF is anticipated to generate $630 million over twenty years. That revenue will be used to leverage an additional $820 million in other local, state, and federal transportation revenues to fund a $1.4 billion expenditure program. This will fund a set of highly-efficient and cost-effective improvements to the transportation system which will offset the impact of twenty years of development activity on that system. The program will focus on initiatives which show the greatest positive impact on transportation system performance.

The program hit a major milestone this fiscal year when Mayor Lee, Supervisor Wiener, and Supervisor Olague introduced an ordinance establishing a key component of the Transportation Sustainability Program – the Transportation Sustainability Fee on May 15, 2012. At the same time, the sponsors also introduced an ordinance updating the Transit Impact Development Fee.

For more info on the Transportation Sustainability Program: http://tsp.sfplanning.org
As part of the overall effort to improve process efficiency, the department revised the development review process for moderate-to-large-sized projects. The result is a three-phase process which became effective February 1, 2011. The review process now features a preliminary step for applicants, called the Preliminary Project Assessment (PPA).

The assessment ensures applicants understand the approval process and are aware of any potential issues that may need to be addressed before their development applications are filed.

The assessment is required for any project proposing to add six dwelling units, construct more than 10,000 square feet of non-residential space, or for any applicant wishing to file an Environmental Review or Entitlement Application.

The result of the preliminary review is a letter issued within 60 days providing preliminary feedback to project sponsors early in the development process.

To date, staff found a number of improvements in productivity since the new process was implemented including:

- Better informed project sponsors early in development
- Proper assignment of projects the appropriate staff base on skill and capacity
- Quicker processing of projects
- Improved coordination of projects between department divisions

In the first full fiscal year since implementation, the department has received 47 PPA applications.
Parcel P Project

SF Planning first got involved with the Parcel P (from the old Central Freeway) project in March 2011 when the Preliminary Project Assessment was filed, and by June 28th, the project successfully sailed through to approval by the Planning Commission.

The speedy process for project approval was due in part to very little opposition to the project, the use of a Community Plan exemption, and staff efforts in developing a collaborative relationship with the project sponsors, and working alongside to improve the design to better promote diversity and the ‘living street’ concept.

With this project, three architects were commissioned to help ‘break up’ the development, creating three distinct buildings designs, preventing the creation of a singular look for a whole block. Through the help of staff, the streets were activated with the inclusion of curb extensions, seating, planters, and other functional and aesthetic amenities to enhance the public realm. Open space in the form of private decks, common rooftop decks, and common open space at the ground are also included.

The Project Site is well-served by transit and commercial services, allowing residents to commute, shop, and reach amenities by walking, transit, and bicycling. Promoting active transportation, the site will also have ten guest bicycles as part of a “bicycle share” program.

Adding housing and commercial goods and services to create a vibrant, active mixed-use node, the project includes a mix of unit types, including 53 studio units, 56 one-bedroom units, and 73 two-bedroom units.

This mix of units and thoughtful design will ensure that the project serves a diversity of household sizes and people with varied housing needs today and in the future.
The 55 Laguna development is a planning success for a number of reasons. The project integrates about 5 acres of land into the city’s fabric through a new pedestrian park (Waller Park) that bisects the site east to west on the former Waller Street right-of-way, it replaces retaining walls with residential lobbies, stoops and unit entrances to activate Laguna, Haight and Buchanan Streets, and introduces buildings that are compatible with the site’s existing architecture while relating to the surrounding residential context.

Located on two city blocks in the heart of the Hayes Valley and one-half block from Market Street, on the former University of California Extension site, the site is currently used for surface parking and does not provide any public access.

Two types of housing will be featured on the site. A market-rate development that includes up to 330 rental units, with 50 designated as on-site affordable housing. The project also proposes the city’s first affordable housing development for lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender (LGBT) seniors. The seniors development includes up to 110 rental units for low-income seniors, and a 7,500 square-foot seniors’ center for residents and LGBT seniors from across the City. This initiative was spearheaded by then-Commission President, Christina Olague.

Three unique amenities are included in the development. Waller Park will be 28,000 square feet and includes high-quality landscaping furniture and features that will invite the public to enjoy views of the East Bay and find places of respite throughout. The 10,000 square foot community garden will be available to the public as well as development residents. A 12,000 square foot community center will be made available for public use. Development residents can also take advantage of private facilities such as a lounge, clubhouse, gym, yoga studio and bicycle repair shop.

The goal is to build the development to LEED gold standards, using strategies such as providing 10 City Car Share pods, using seasonal water collection and filtration at Waller Park, installing 100% fluorescent lighting and Energy Star appliances, providing 125 bicycle storage spaces for residents, and less than 1:1 off-street parking spaces.

The project also promotes the adaptive reuse of three locally designated landmarks: Woods Hall, Woods Hall Annex, and Richardson Hall, which will be converted from educational facilities to housing units and the community center.

Through no less than four points of public access, the isolated institutional site will be reintroduced into fabric of the city to be enjoyed by all. Removal of perimeter retaining walls and construction of residential buildings will introduce residential lobbies, stoops, and porches along the street frontages to greatly enhance the existing pedestrian environment on Laguna, Haight and Buchanan Streets. All these features, plus excellent streetscape design and quality materials, will create a new sense of place in the site’s established neighborhood. The development will result in a new contemporary and inclusive neighborhood on a site that has been dramatically underutilized for years.

The market-rate development, initially entitled in 2008, and re-entitled in 2012, is scheduled to be completed by 2014.
Top: Looking southwest from the intersection of Haight and Laguna Streets.

Left: Looking east along Waller Park at Buchanan Street.

55 Laguna Development Project
Highlights: New Programs

17th and Folsom Park: The city awarded a $2.6 million grant, matching $2.4 million in projected impact fee revenue, to build the new 17th and Folsom Park in the Mission District. Construction is scheduled to begin in spring 2013. [1]
http://17thfolsompark.sfplanning.org

Sustainable Development (Eco-District) Program: Launched in July 2011, this program looks at implementing sustainable infrastructure systems that coordinate building development and public infrastructure, and developing pilot projects in the Central Corridor and Transit Center areas. [2]
http://sustainabledevelopment.sfplanning.org

Green Connections: This two-year long project started in August 2011, looking at ways to increase pedestrian and bicycle access to parks, open space and the waterfront, by re-envisioning City streets and paths as ‘green connectors’. Staff will create a draft citywide network of Green Connections, and design concepts by Fall 2012. The focus is to develop conceptual street designs in six neighborhoods (Bayview-Hunters Point, Chinatown, Potrero Hill, Tenderloin, Visitacion Valley, and Western Addition). The project is funded by a grant awarded by the State of California Strategic Growth Council. [3]
http://greenconnections.sfplanning.org

Urban Forest Master Plan: Work began on the Urban Forest Master Plan in Spring 2012, in collaboration with DPW and Friends of the Urban Forest, to promote San Francisco’s urban forest with a primary focus on street trees. The plan’s goal is to create an expanded, healthy and thriving urban forest now and for the future. [4]
http://urbanforest.sfplanning.org

Environment Review for Transit Effectiveness Project: The department began work on an environmental review for the Transit Effectiveness Project, a project set to improve transit service reliability, reduce transit travel time, improve transit customer experiences, and improve transit service effectiveness and efficiency. An initial study is currently underway and anticipated to be published in 2012.

Fee Study: The department began a comprehensive study of the fees charged with processing applications. The last study was conducted in 2006. Since then, fees have been annually adjusted based on the average Consumer Price Index (CPI) rate and other additional fee changes. The completion of a comprehensive fee study will allow for the readjustment of many of the Department’s fees to ensure appropriate cost recovery and the equitable setting of fees across all fee types. The fee study is scheduled to be completed next fiscal year.

Server Consolidation: Initiated consolidation of an enterprise server room with the Human Services Agency and Department of Building Inspection at 1660 Mission Street.

Open Data: More information is now available to the public for download. New data from the department includes: case information, zoning, heights, Special Use districts, neighborhoods, open spaces, historic districts, wireless telecoms, among others.
https://data.sfgov.org

Director’s Reports: Included in commission packages and available to the public, the bi-weekly Director’s Report summarizes key accomplishments, department news, and issues of interest to the Planning Commission and Historic Preservation Commission.

San Francisco Atlas: This full-size poster summarizes demographic and housing trends by neighborhood and covers the 1990, 2000 and 2010 Censuses.

Eastern Neighborhoods Monitoring Reports 2006-2010: The first round of Eastern Neighborhoods monitoring reports was released this fiscal year, pursuant to the adoption of the Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plans in 2008. The reports describe trends and implementation progress in the areas of commercial development, employment, housing supply, residential development, open space, transportation, and infrastructure improvements.
Adoption of the Landmark Designation Work Program: The adopted program includes 18 individual properties and three districts being considered for Article 10 landmark designation. At its June 20, 2012 hearing the Historic Preservation Commission unanimously approved a recommendation to the Board of Supervisors for its first designation from the work program, Sam Jordan’s Bar.

Interagency Plan Implementation Committee (IPIC): The IPIC programmed over $10 million in projected impact fee revenue for fiscal years 2012-13 and 2013-14 for public improvements, working with City implementation agencies and Citizens Advisory Committees.

Hayes Street Two-Way Conversion: Hayes Street from Van Ness Avenue to Gough Street was converted from a one-way thoroughfare to a two-way neighborhood street using Market and Octavia impact fee revenue.

Launch of SF Better Streets Website: The department in collaboration with the DPW, SFPUC and SFMTA launched the how-to website, www.sfbetterstreets.org, a comprehensive web resource for making street improvements in San Francisco. The new website is an initiative under the Better Streets Plan, adopted in December 2010.

Executive Park Sub-Area Plan: Adopted in July 2011, the plan sets to transform Executive Park, the unrealized office park east of Highway 101, into San Francisco’s newest residential neighborhood.

Glen Park Community Plan: Adopted in February 2012, the plan includes comprehensive recommendations to preserve and enhance the unique character of Glen Park, with a focus on the “village” or downtown Glen Park. http://glenpark.sfplanning.org

Newcomb Avenue Model Block: Built in December 2011, Newcomb Avenue has been transformed into one of the most sustainable and green streets in San Francisco.

EN Trips: The final report completed in January 2012, in collaboration with SFMTA, establishing recommendations for the improvement of 3 key transportation corridors in the Eastern Neighborhoods. The department is currently working on securing funding for environmental review of the EN Trips recommendations.
The Glen Park Community Plan explores a number of neighborhood improvements. Some of these are identified on this map:

- Improve informal greenway connection between "downtown" and Glen Canyon Park.
- Study feasibility of daylighting a portion of Islais Creek.
- BART to initiate a community process to evaluate alternative uses for parking lot.
- Improve pedestrian conditions at Diamond & Bosworth intersection.
- Improve pedestrian conditions at Bosworth & Castro intersection.
- Redesign BART Plaza to better address the neighborhood.
- Pedestrian improvements.
- Explore travel improvements around BART Station.
- Pedestrian and traffic calming improvements at intersections.
- Create accessible connection between BART and the Muni J-Church line.
- Explore transit improvements around BART Station.
- Restore neighborhood connections.
- Address pedestrian safety in and around the Village.
- Develop solutions to calm traffic.
- Increase availability of on-street parking.
- Establish safer bike connections.
- Address pedestrian safety to and around the Village.
- Develop solutions to calm traffic.
- Increase availability of on-street parking.
- Establish safer bike connections.
- The Glen Park Community Plan explores a number of neighborhood improvements. Some of these are identified on this map.
Highlights: In Progress

Permit & Project Tracking System: This system aims to consolidate multiple systems into a single citywide permitting system. The project, in collaboration with the Department of Building Inspection, executed a contract with Accela and 21Tech to begin implementation of this project.

To date, analysis and configuration is complete. The next phase, scheduled to begin in August of 2012, will include building system interfaces, designing reports, and converting historical data. The system is anticipated to go live November 2013.

http://ppts.sfplanning.org

Community Safety Element: The department completed an extensive update to the Community Safety Element within the City’s General Plan. This Element establishes policies to protect San Francisco from risks associated with natural and man-made disasters, and aims to better address the City’s objectives of mitigation, preparation, response, and recovery.

The update sets forth a number of policies that are intended to further the objectives and guide future decision-making related to community safety. An environmental analysis was also conducted by the department, with a Negative Declaration published on May 23, 2012. The updated was unanimously adopted by the Planning Commission in June 2012. Full adoption by the Board of Supervisors is expected in Summer 2012.

WalkFirst/Pedestrian Safety Task Force: The WalkFirst draft report was completed in October 2011, describing a citywide network of key walking streets and capital project list of pedestrian improvements. The Department is working with the SFMTA and other City agencies to complete a Pedestrian Strategy, expected Fall 2012.

http://walkfirst.sfplanning.org

General Advertising Sign Program: The department completed a review of all signs in the City, finding that nearly half of them were completely illegal. In total, the program resulted in the removal of more than 800 individual signs over the past five years. Additionally, the program generated $439,000 in gross revenue in this fiscal year. The primary goals of the program are to maintain an inventory of all advertising signs in San Francisco, correct outstanding Planning Code violations, and to remove unlawful signs.

http://gasp.sfplanning.org

Public Outreach and Engagement Program: Research on this program was completed this fiscal year with a department-wide assessment of current efforts. Recommendations for improvement were developed, along with initial principles, goals, and guidelines for the program. Implementation is scheduled to begin next fiscal year.

Better Market Street: In collaboration with other City agencies, the department developed initial design concepts for the Better Market Street Project which were shown in a series of public meetings in July 2012. The project goal is to revitalize Market Street and strengthen its role as the premier civic, cultural and economic corridor in the Bay Area, while improving the speed and reliability of the transit system and the comfort and safety of the bicycle space.

http://www.bettermarketstreetsf.org

Chinatown Broadway: Using the feedback received the public, the project team developed a new street design to transform the corridor from a busy thoroughfare to a more walkable, safer and inviting neighborhood street. The project team is now working on securing funding for final design and implementation of the proposed improvements. This project is funded by a grant from the CalTrans Environmental Justice Program.

http://broadway.sfplanning.org

Cesar Chavez East: Design plans have been completed for Cesar Chavez East to improve the pedestrian and bicycle environment on this underserved corridor using grant funds from CalTrans Environmental Justice Program.

http://chavezeast.sfplanning.org
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Publications

Completed Reports
- Showplace Square/Northeast Mission historic resources survey
- South of Market historic survey
- Eastern Neighborhood Area Plan historic resource survey
- Central Corridor Plan Concepts
- WalkFirst Final Report
- Revised Draft of the Recreation and Open Space Element
- Eastern Neighborhoods Monitoring Reports
- San Francisco Neighborhoods Socio-Economic Profiles

Completed Design Plans
- Jefferson Street Public Realm Plan
- Cesar Chavez East Community Design Plan
- Chinatown Broadway Community Design Plan
Published Environmental Impact Reports

- 706 Mission Street – The Mexican Museum and Residential Tower Project (Draft)
- 1601 Larkin Street Housing Project (Final)
- 800 Presidio Avenue (Final)
- 8 Washington Street/Seawall Lot 351 Project (Final)
- Beach Chalet Athletic Fields Renovation (Final)
- Chinese Hospital (Final)
- Executive Park Sub-area Plan (Final)
- Glen Park Community Plan (Final)
- Natural Resources Area Management Plan (Draft)
- North Beach Public Library and Joe DiMaggio Playground Master Plan (Final)
- San Antonio Backup Pipeline Project (Draft)
- San Francisco Overlook Residential Development Project (Draft)
- SF Museum of Modern Art Expansion/Fire Station Relocation (Final)
- Significant Natural Resources Areas Management Plan (Draft)
- Transit Center District Plan & Transit Tower (Final)
- The 34th America’s Cup and James R. Herman Cruise Terminal & Northeast Wharf Plaza (Final)
- Western SoMa Community Plan, Rezoning of Adjacent Parcels and 350 Eighth Street (Draft)
- Western SoMa Plan (Draft)

Other Published Environmental Documents

- Community Safety Element
- Fisherman’s Wharf Public Realm Plan
- Parklets
- Pavement to Parks
- SFO Gas Station Project
- Minnie and Lovie Ward Playfields Renovation
- SFO Runway Safeway Area Program
- North Shore to Channel Force Main Project
- Geary Road Bridge Replacement
Awards & Accolades

Candlestick Point – Hunters Point Shipyard Phase II, Environmental Impact Report

- 2012 Hard-Won Victory Achievement Award, National American Planning Association
- 2012 Hard-Won Victory Achievement Award, American Planning Association, California Chapter
- 2012 Hard-Won Victory Achievement Award, American Planning Association, Northern California Chapter

Mission District Streetscape Plan

- 2011 Merit Award, American Society of Landscape Architects, Northern California Chapter

Better Streets Plan

- 2011 Best Practices Award, American Planning Association, California Chapter
- 2011 Best Practices Award, American Planning Association, Northern California Chapter
- 2011 Charter Award, Congress for the New Urbanism

San Francisco Modern Architecture and Landscape Design (Modern Design) Historic Context Statement

- 2011 Governor’s Historic Preservation Award
- 2012 California Preservation Foundation Preservation Design Award

Pavement to Parks

- 2011 Beautification Award, SF Beautiful
- 2012 Sustainable Transport Award, Institute for Transportation and Development Policy *
- 2012 Special Commendation, American Institute of Architects, San Francisco Chapter

* awarded to Pavement to Parks and SF Park

Environmental planners Lisa Gibson (l) and Joy Navarette (r) at the 2012 National Planning Awards.
## Grants

### Grants Awarded

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Awarded by/Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>Awarded by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission for the Environmental Impact Report for the Central Corridor Plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>ESTIMATED VALUE IN TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$49,000</td>
<td>Awarded by the Urban Sustainability Director’s Network to conduct research on local food sector innovations for urban decision-makers to support long-term investment in local- and regionally based self-reliant food systems.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$22,500</td>
<td>Awarded by the California Office of Historic Preservation, to research and author a Historic Context Statement on builder tract housing development from 1925-1950 in the Sunset District.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$22,500</td>
<td>Awarded by the California Office of Historic Preservation Green Communities Program to incorporate preservation practices into EcoDistrict efforts in Central Corridor.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total grants awarded in 2011/2012: $569,000

### Grants Completed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Awarded by/Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$65,000</td>
<td>SF Bay Trail, to engineer a portion of the Jefferson Street streetscape</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>Caltrans Environmental Justice; streetscape improvement design plans on Broadway Avenue in Chinatown.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>Caltrans Environmental Justice: street design improvements along eastern Cesar Chavez.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total grants completed in 2011/2012: $565,000
Planning by the Numbers
2011-2012 Stats

**Approved Building Permits**

- **New Construction**: 85
- **Existing Alterations**: 6,348

**Changes to the Planning Code**

- **Text Changes**: 25
- **Zoning Changes**: 15
- **General Plan Referrals**: 46

**Completed Environmental Reviews**

- 89

**Categorically Exempt Projects from Environmental Review**

- 431

**Filed Discretionary Reviews**

- 130

**Designated Landmarks & Districts**

- 8

**Zoning Administrator Letters**

- Letters of Determination: 95
- Zoning Verification: 249

**Eastern Neighborhoods Letters**: 13
### Project Activity

#### Project Review Meetings Conducted for Potential Projects
- **258**

#### Preliminary Project Assessment Applications
- **47**

### Planning Information Center

- **2,000+** Permits approved over-the-counter

### Enforcement

- **452** Cases closed
- **457** New cases
- **$81,997** Amount collected in penalties, code violation, and other fees

**ILLEGAL COMMERCIAL USE!** Most common complaint

### Variances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denied</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Withdrawn</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Board of Supervisors

**25** Appeals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upheld *</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overruled</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Withdrawn</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awaiting Final Action</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 2 with modifications

### Board of Appeals

**53** Appeals (including the first appeal of a decision by the Historic Preservation Commission)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upheld</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overruled *</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Withdrawn</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awaiting Final Action</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 11 of which were ultimately approved by the Board with additional conditions

### Pavement to Parks Program

- **4** Total Plazas installed as of 2012
- **29** Total Parklets installed as of 2012
- **8** Parklets installed in 2011-2012
- **39** New Parklets under review
### Housing Production

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planning Area</th>
<th>Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Balboa Park</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Waterfront</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown</td>
<td>-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East SoMa</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market/Octavia</td>
<td>306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission Bay</td>
<td>634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Showplace Sq/Potrero Hill</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West SoMa</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rest of the City</td>
<td>1,086</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2011-2012 Total Units Permitted: 2,548

### Commercial Space

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planning Area</th>
<th>Sq. Feet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Balboa Park</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Waterfront</td>
<td>-1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown</td>
<td>73,514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East SoMa</td>
<td>-5,425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market/Octavia</td>
<td>18,622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission</td>
<td>1,477</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission Bay</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Showplace Sq/Potrero Hill</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West SoMa</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rest of the City</td>
<td>272,060</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2011-2012 Total Square Feet: 359,248
The department assumed that case and permit volume would increase by 3% in FY11-12 from the prior fiscal year in the budget. Through the first half of the fiscal year, case and permit volume was approximately flat compared to the same time last fiscal year. Since then, volume has ramped up through the end of December and the remainder of the fiscal year. Overall, total volume, including building permits and cases, are up by 5.5% in FY11-12 compared to FY10-11. The largest volume increases were realized with building permits for existing alterations, certificates of appropriateness, conditional use, categorical exemptions, Federal environmental review for MOCD, and Mills Act cases. FY11-12 volumes were the largest since FY07-08.
### Case & Permit Volume 2000-2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Study Analysis</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificate of Appropriateness</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Limit Comp.</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conditional Use + CU Appeal</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discretionary Review</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Evaluation + Appeals</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Categorical Exemptions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal E Review for MOCD</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designate/Redesignate Bldg Rating</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permit to Alter</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Master Plan</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement of Eligibility Application</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shadow Study Analysis</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landmark Preservation / Historic District</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Plan Amendment</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application for Certificate of Transfer of TDR</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal Zone Permit</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condominium Conversion</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Plan Referral</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subdivision of Land</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoning Text Amendment</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mills Act or Other Usual Cases</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Agreement</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown Control Exception</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application for Notice of Use of TDR</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoning Reclassification / Map Change</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Plan Referral</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Permits (Existing Alterations)</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>7,365</td>
<td>6,073</td>
<td>6,247</td>
<td>6,207</td>
<td>6,348</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL** 8,840 9,548 9,510 10,115 10,030 9,664 9,099 7,650 7,637 7,850 8,281

Source: Case Edit Intake Database & DBI Permit Database Downloads

Note: Volume data does not include the following activities: Medical Cannabis Dispensary, Referrals from Other Departments (Fire, Police, Health, etc.), Section 311, Block Book Notification, Letters of Determination, and Temporary Use Permits (i.e. Pumpkin Patch).
During the 2012-14 budget process, the department revised its set of performance measures to focus on outcomes, efficiency and customer service, in order to more accurately track the work of the department and inform and encourage more performance-based decision making by department staff and management.

This year’s performance in meeting a number of objectives were adversely affected by the continuous increase in workload and additional Planning Code and CEQA requirements. Staffing levels have stayed relatively flat with few new hires and a number of staff lost due to attrition. (See Staff List on page 46)

As a result, the department anticipates reviews for building permits will increase from 60 to 90 days and conditional use applications to increase from 120 to 180 days. Despite improving efficiencies, environmental impact reports continue to take two years, on average, to complete.

The department continues to see progress in performance on a number of projects. For example, the department plans to successfully implement Permit and Project Tracking System (PPTS) by November of 2013, and is on track with 88% of the project scheduled to be implemented by the end of FY12-13.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>PERFORMANCE MEASURE</th>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>FY 2011-2012 ACTUAL</th>
<th>FY 2012-2013 TARGET</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Percentage of all building permits involving new construction and alterations review, approved or disapproved within 90 days</td>
<td>Efficiency</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Percentage of conditional use applications requiring Commission action approved or disapproved within 180 days</td>
<td>Efficiency</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Percentage of public initiated Discretionary Review applications approved or disapproved within 90 days</td>
<td>Efficiency</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Percent of event participants who rated community events as good or very good</td>
<td>Customer Service</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Percent of general plan referrals completed within 45 days</td>
<td>Efficiency</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Transit Center District Plan submittal for final approval at the Board of Supervisors by December of 2012</td>
<td>Outcome</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Percent of projected development impact fee revenue for the following 2 fiscal years programmed by fiscal year end</td>
<td>Outcome</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Percent of all environmental impact reports (EIRs) completed within 24 months</td>
<td>Efficiency</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Percent of Negative Declarations (Neg Decs), Class 32s, Community Plan Exemptions (CPEs), and Addenda completed within 9 months</td>
<td>Efficiency</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Percentage of categorical exemptions reviewed within 45 days</td>
<td>Efficiency</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Percent of complaints where enforcement proceedings have been initiated within 30 business days of complaint filing</td>
<td>Outcome</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Percentage of Ordinances initiated by an elected office that are reviewed by the Commission within 90 days or continued at the request of the elected official</td>
<td>Efficiency</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Percent completion of the Permit and Project Tracking System (PPTS) to be fully implemented for staff use by November of 2013</td>
<td>Outcome</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Planning core network uptime percent</td>
<td>Outcome</td>
<td>99.9%</td>
<td>99.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Percent of helpdesk requests resolved within 24 hours</td>
<td>Customer Service</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Financial Report

Revenues

Total Revenues
$24,604,399

Fee Revenue

Total Fee Revenue
$19,630,295

Expenditures

Total Expenditures
$24,604,399

Revenue FY11-12 Adopted Budget
- Fees $19,630,295
- Grants $1,448,084
- Expenditure Recovery $1,620,709
- General Fund Support $1,905,311

Fee FY11-12 Adopted Budget
- Building Permit Alterations $9,460,536
- Building Permit New Construction $1,903,524
- Environmental Review Fees $4,467,312
- Other Short Range Planning Fees $1,508,676
- Conditional Use Fees $1,329,837
- Variance Fees $484,137
- Sign Program & Code Enforcement $354,000
- Certificate of Appropriateness Fees $122,273

Expenditure FY11-12 Final Budget
- Salaries & Fringe $19,819,535
- Overhead $97,101
- Non-Personnel Services, Materials & Supplies, Capital & Projects $1,321,903
- Services of Other Departments $3,365,860
# General Fund Support for the Planning Department 2000-2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Fund Support</td>
<td>$4.2</td>
<td>$3.0</td>
<td>$4.1</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td>$0.4</td>
<td>$1.5</td>
<td>$2.0</td>
<td>$3.3</td>
<td>$3.2</td>
<td>$3.4</td>
<td>$1.4</td>
<td>$1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fees &amp; Other Revenues</td>
<td>$9.6</td>
<td>$11.9</td>
<td>$9.0</td>
<td>$13.2</td>
<td>$16.1</td>
<td>$16.0</td>
<td>$19.1</td>
<td>$21.7</td>
<td>$22.5</td>
<td>$20.5</td>
<td>$22.4</td>
<td>$22.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Revenues</strong></td>
<td><strong>$13.8</strong></td>
<td><strong>$14.9</strong></td>
<td><strong>$13.1</strong></td>
<td><strong>$13.2</strong></td>
<td><strong>$16.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>$17.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>$21.1</strong></td>
<td><strong>$25.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$25.7</strong></td>
<td><strong>$23.9</strong></td>
<td><strong>$23.8</strong></td>
<td><strong>$24.6</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Fund Support %</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**2011-2012 General Fund Support**

$1.9M

% of Total Revenue

8%

---

**NOTES:**

- In FY03-04 through FY05-06, appropriations from the Building Inspection Fund were used in lieu of General Fund Support ($2.3 Million, $5.3 Million and $1.7 Million, respectively).
- Increase in FY11-12 Proposed Budget due to the Health Care Services Master Plan.
2011-2012 Staff List

Planning Department Staff

Aaron Hollister
Aaron Starr
Adam Varat
Adrian Putra
Agnes Lau
Aksel Olsen
Alexis Smith
Alicia John-Baptiste
Alton Chinn
Amnon Ben-Pazi
Andrea Contreras
Andrea Green
Andrea Modena
Andres Power -
Angela Huisman +
AnMarie Rodgers
Ben Fu
Bill Wycko
Brett Bollinger
Brian Smith
Brittany Bendix
Cathy Thai
Chelsea Fordham
Christine Haw
Christine Lamorena
Christopher Espiritu +
Claudia Flores
Corey Teague
Daniel Sider
David Alumbaugh
David Lindsay
David Winslow
Debra Dwyer
Delvin Washington
Devyan Jain
Diego Sanchez
Donald Lewis
Donnie Wong
Doug Vu +
Edgar Oropeza
Elizabeth Skrondal
Elizabeth Watty
Erika Jackson
Evarmarie Atijera-Taylor
Frank Jones
Gary Chen
Genta Yosikawa
Georgia Powell
Gladys Fausto-Chan
Glenn Cabreros
Gregory Riessen
Gretchen Hilyard +
Heidi Kline +
Hien Nguyen +
Ilaria Salvadori
Irene Cheng Tam
Irene Nishimura
Isabelle Vulis
Isoken Omokaro
Janice Shambray
Jeanie Poling
Jeremy Battis -
Jessica Look +
Jessica Range
Jim McCormick -
Joanna Linsangan +
John Bilovits -
John Rahaim
Johnny Jaramillo
Jonas Ionin
Jonathan Purvis
Jonathan Swae
Jose Campos +
Joshua Switzky
Josie Lee
Joy Navarrete
Julian Banales
Karen Zhu
Kate Conner
Kate McGee
Kay Cheng +
Kearstin Dischinger
Kei Zushi +
Keith DeMartini
Kelley Amdur
Kevin Brusatori
Kevin Guy
Kimberly Durandet
Kimia Haddadan +
Lily Langlois
Linda Avery-Herbert
Lisa Chau
Lisa Gibson
Lulu Hwang
Margaret Yuen
Maria Oropeza-Mander
Mark Luellen
Mary Brown
Mary Woods
Mat Snyder
Matthew Weintraub -
Michael Jacinto
Michael Smith
Michael Webster
Michael Wynne
Michaeal Sanders
Michelle Stahlhut +
Milton Martin
Monica Pereira
Monica Way -
Moses Corrette
Nannie Turrell
Neil Hrushowy
Nicholas Perry
Nora Priego-Ramos
Ozzie Taeb
Patricia Gerber
Paul Chasan
Paul Lord -
Paul Maltzer
Pilar LaValley
Rachel Schuett
Rachna
Randall Dean
Richard Suer
e
Rick Cooper
Rick Crawford
Sandra Soto-Grondona
Sara Vellve
Sarah Dennis Phillips
Sarah Jones
Scott Edmondson +
Scott Sanchez
Sharon Lai
Sharon Young
Sheila Nickolopoulos
SFPUC Staff

Chris Kern
Diana Sokolove
Steven Smith
Timothy Johnston

Planning Interns

Ada Tan
Alexandra Kerby
Alexi Martin
Angela Locke
Benjamin Caldwell
Erik Jaszewski
Eunice Lau
Forrest Chamberlain
Jacob Kraemer
Rebecca Sunter
Samantha Dolgoff
Sherrie Wayman
Stella Yip
Susan Parks
Thayer Mullins
Wendy Chen

New to the Team

Shelley Caltagirone
Sophie Hayward
Stephen Shotland +
Stephen Wertheim
Susan Exline
Susan Mickelsen
Susan Wong
Tara Sullivan
Teresa Ojeda
Theresa Monchez +
Tom Wang
Timothy Frye
Tina Tam
Tom DiSanto
Viktoriya Wise
VirnaLiza Byrd
Vladimir Vallejo +
Wade Wietgrefe +
Yvonne Ko

Former Colleagues

Anthony Urbina
1958 - 2011

Scott Dowdee
1956 - 2011

In Memoriam
In Memoriam