

PUBLIC ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MEETING NOTES

Wednesday, November 14, 2012 2:00 p.m. to 3:30 p.m.

1660 Mission Street 2nd Floor, Room 2001

1. WELCOME & INTRODUCTIONS

Acting Director Hui welcomed everyone to the meeting and introductions were made.

As Planning was not yet in attendance, Director Hui began with Item 3.

3. DISCUSSION OF DPW REQUEST FOR EARLY PLAN SUBMITTALS

John Kwong, DPW suggested changing the routing to have DPW follow Planning review on projects, prior to routing to Building in order to identify DPW related issues and avoid delays.

It was asked what project would fall under DPW review. John responded that if a project is Form 3, it automatically gets routed to DPW. Typical turnaround times for DPW review is three to four days. If projects have a complete set of plans, DPW may process and issue same day.

Director Hui asked if the requested change in the routing would also be prior to Building and Fire reviews. Mr. Kwong stated yes.

Director Hui suggested that if customer request DPW review early, they can duplicate one copy of plans approved by Planning and send to DPW for review. Meanwhile, the review process continues with the other agencies. If the plans are initially sent to DPW, it will cause delays for other review stations.

Mr. Kwong suggested an additional set be routed to DPW as part of the parallel process.

It was asked if DPW staff would still be available for signoffs at the 5th floor. Mr. Kwong stated staff is available.

2. MISCELLANEOUS PLANNING ISSUES

a. Discussion of Design Review Process

Drake Gardner raised this issue to ask for clarification on the process, discuss issues the public is experiencing, and how to make improvements.

Director Rahaim stated Jeff Joslin of his staff will serve as the Planning representative at these meetings.

Director Rahaim commented the frustration he's heard with regard to the Design Review Process is the residential design team seems to review projects on their own. There is concern about how they do that and whether they should have more interaction with the architect or project sponsor. One of the biggest complaints he's heard since coming to Planning were that design comments were inconsistent depending on whom the Planner was. The concept of setting up the structure of the residential design team is to try and bring consistency to reviews and to have the same set of people review projects. Mr. Gardner stated that this aspect is working, but you get to a point where buildings are starting to look the same.

Mr. Gardner brought up the issue of having comments re-reviewed by the design team. He feels Planners should be able to look at the comments and make the decisions themselves to save time. Jeff Joslin agreed unless there is something about the redesign that involves a "gray area" that would require more discussion with their supervisor.

Mr. Gardner stated there is no way to get involved in the process if there is a disagreement. Director Rahaim stated that project review meetings can be scheduled any time. Mr. Joslin stated Planning is in the process of addressing workload and staffing issues.

Mr. Gardner brought up the requirement for shadow studies. Director Rahaim commented Planning has streamlined the process of when it is required. If a project is below 40 feet, it is not required. If it is above 40 feet, there is a simple GIS that will allow them to see if there is a possibility of a shadow.

Henry Karnilowicz asked if Planning is addressing delays related to its HRER reviews. Mr. Joslin reported the backlog on these reviews is approximately five to six months. This is the first area that will be addressed with new hires.

It was asked if Mr. Joslin would provide an update on the suggestions that were submitted to Director Rahaim at a future meeting. Mr. Joslin would be happy to provide.

4. UPDATE ON PERMIT AND PROJECT TRACKING SYSTEM

Penny Venable provided an update of the project timeline. They are currently in the Build Stage which involves analysis of the data conversion, systems interfaces, reports, and testing. They are on schedule to complete this stage by April 2013. The next phase would be Stage 5 Readiness, which would run through August 2013. System go-live is scheduled from August through November 2013.

They will be forming a Citizen Advisory Group (CAG). A meeting will be held on November 28 with Planning and Building Inspection Commission representatives to review the purpose of the CAG, the make-up of the group, and the timeline for the meetings. Individuals elected to the CAG will attend approximately three meetings for one to one-half hour in length beginning mid-January through March 2013. There will be other opportunities to participate such as User Acceptance Testing. Those who wish to volunteer may submit their interest to Carolyn Jayin.

There was an inquiry on the conversion of data and ensuring the information is correct. Ms. Venable stated staff is working on extensive data mapping to verify information. Director Hui stated the Department hopes to have staff that will go and correct information in the database.

5. UPDATE ON LEGISLATION AFFECTING DBI

Kirk Means reported on Housing Code amendments related to grab bars and phone jacks in SRO buildings that will be submitted for further review. It was stated that phone jacks are required in every room according to State law.

Pamela Levin stated there is legislation going before the Land Use Committee that deals with application expirations. It starts the time limit when the application is returned to DBI. It also increases the maximum time work can be completed for \$100K+ project valuations.

Additionally, staff discovered there was a mistake made in the cost of 3R reports. When the update occurred, the publisher changed the number back to \$100. Also, it decreased the majority of the fees for reproduction back to \$0.10 per page to coincide with the cost related to the Sunshine Ordinance.

6. ROUNDTABLE DISCUSSION

There was an issue on the application of AB-017 for a recent project. Director Hui suggested the project sponsor meet with Ed Sweeney for clarification.

There is a situation in the field where a customer will not receive an inspection if their next phase permit is not yet approved. This is occurring in architectural. If it involves an individual plan checker, Director Hui can speak to Ed on this item. The main concern is that work in-house is not catching up to field work. It was suggested that customers seek assistance from a supervisor should they experience this.

Ed Sweeney stated there will be an upcoming 6331 test, and DBI hopes to have more staff on board after January 1.

Dan Lowrey advised members inspections are busy this time of year and suggested that customers give themselves some leeway when scheduling their inspections.

Director Hui announced that staff will be attending ADA training at the end of November and beginning of December. They may experience delays in services. Notices will be posted throughout the building to advise customers.

Henry Karnilowicz made an inquiry on refunds. Pamela Levin stated the amount refunded depends on many factors. Additionally, there is a fee DBI charges to process refunds. Daniel Lowrey stated it is a slow process because inspection staff needs to field verify no work has been done prior to approving a request for refund. If a request for refund is for a permit with a filed status, it is a different process. Specific questions regarding the refund process can be directed to Pamela Levin or John Blackshear.

Director Hui advised members of an email from Ken Wong, DPH that requests any change in store fronts, windows, exhaust systems, remodel of bathrooms for any food preparation facility be reviewed by DPH. Director Hui has invited Mr. Wong to attend the PAC to clarify but he has not accepted.

7. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

No future agenda items were discussed.

Future meetings will be coordinated in order for Planning to attend.

8. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 3:48 pm.