



PUBLIC ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MEETING NOTES

Wednesday, June 26, 2013
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.

2. DISCUSSION OF SFUSD FEE PAYMENT AT 1660 MISSION

Acting Director Hui had proposed that SFUSD fees be paid at DBI. Details are being worked along with SFUSD and will be providing more information in September.

3. UPDATE ON LEGISLATION AFFECTING DBI

Bill Strawn reported the Maher Toxics Ordinance legislation was approved by the BIC and Land Use heard it Monday. The legislation was forwarded to the Board of Supervisors and is expected to be approved and go into effect mid August.

The Public Utilities Commission is considering introducing a legislation to set up sharing of district gray waters. Bill stated proposal may violate building codes; therefore DBI will be providing feedback to the PUC.

Public Health – Environmental Division plans to introduce a legislation to regulate emissions coming from equipment at job sites to ensure they are below a certain threshold. DBI will look into how much of an enforcement issue this would become to DBI Inspectors.

4. MISCELLANEOUS PLANNING ISSUES

a. Status of Outstanding Planning Issues

Jeff Joslin stated the conversation would be an update from Planning within the last eight months. Jeff began the update with Current Planning. Information on the number of permit volume year by year and month to month was provided. The purpose of the data is mostly for staff tracking as well as back log information.

Jeff reported overall staffing is stable. There has been hiring but also loss of staff due to attrition. New positions have been allocated for preservation, general purpose and current planners, resulting in a 15% staff increase. Planning completed their budget process and will be having new positions including an additional in house architectural reviewer and a preservation compliance planner.

Additional support staff will be added as well. The Board of Supervisors gave Planning pre-approved authority to hire in the future in case additional funds come in. Planning will be able to use supplemental funding without having to get approval. Planning's Public Information Counter will be modified by allocating additional full time staff rather than having preservation floaters. A schedule will be established to display when preservation planners are available.

The draft Addendum Process proposal was forwarded to DBI. The intent of the document is to define the process, have clarity, consistency and efficiency. The draft consists of two stages, pre and post-PPTS and will know what transition will look like after PPTS goes live.

Jeff stated Planning interns are still working on the Design Guidelines aspect. Budget allocations will allow for an in house architect to bring internal capacity and focus to the guidelines. A lot of documents need to be reviewed as there are overlapping inconsistencies and conflicts. There is a separate project to develop qualities for historic properties. It was asked if Planning would have a pre application review meeting process similar to DBI. Jeff responded this document should be clear enough that it would not be necessary. Currently, Planning has a process in place to allow for review.

Jeff reported Planning is looking to update their sign code book as it is over 50 years old. Expectations and technologies have changed therefore Planning is looking to see if general changes should be made. The overall code organization will be reviewed as well. The update will not be content based but a structural framework for staff to review quickly.

There was a comment on the CEQA process. Currently there is a backlog for single family home projects and it's costing more money. It was stated that aside from the five requirements, a replacement of a foundation would require a full CEQA review, \$6000 in fees and a wait time of 6 months. Suggestions were given to streamline the process.

A member of the public stated Planning requires that trees be planted in front of a property if doing exterior work greater than a certain amount. Before Planning would sign off on building permit, the Bureau of Urban Forestry has to determine if a tree can or cannot be planted. If you cannot, in lieu fees need to be paid. Bureau of Urban Forestry has a back log of four weeks; therefore this whole process can take five weeks. DPW will be invited to the next meeting to clarify the process.

5. UPDATE OF DBI ADDENDUM APPROVAL PROCESS

Drake Gardner stated projects are filed and while structural and planning addendum are being worked on architectural and mechanical structural part are approved so field work begins. When the time for an inspection comes, architectural, mechanical and fire addendums are still in Planning, adding additional time to projects. Director Hui stated that Planning needs to review the addendum schedule for residential projects and suggested submitting foundation parallel to architectural. Jeff Joslin stated Planning is working on a protocol and projects that require more detail will be getting schedules in advance to know what to expect.

6. UPDATE ON PERMIT & PROJECT TRACKING SYSTEM

Hema Nekkanti reported PPTS continues to make progress on configuration, receiving feedback, finding gaps, and doing a lot of testing, specifically with fees and reports. Staff will be doing Round Two of user acceptance testing. Round One took place several weeks ago. Staff are preparing for testing in about three weeks, which will test almost every function of DBI and Planning permit process.

7. ROUNDTABLE DISCUSSION

Henry Karnilowicz inquired about site permits. In the past, Planning would approve and release site permits and addendum would go through the stations. Now site permits are taken to DPW, PUC, and other stations and when addendum is submitted, it goes through these stations again. Ed Sweeney, Deputy Director stated he will look into why the process has changed.

A member of the public asked if the process to request over the counter review can be simplified for a full permit. Tony Grieco stated a form needs to be completed and taken to the supervisor of the permit plan checker who has plans and request for over the counter review.

8. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

No future agenda items were discussed.

Acting Director Hui said future agenda items should be brought to Carolyn Jayin's (Carolyn.Jayin@sfgov.org) attention for the next meeting.

9. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 3:13pm