

1 [Adoption of Findings Related to Conditional Use Authorization - 590 Second Avenue]

2
3 **Motion adopting findings in support of the Board of Supervisors’ disapproval of the**
4 **decision of the Planning Commission by its Motion No. 20849, regarding the**
5 **Conditional Use Authorization identified as Planning Case No. 2019-015984CUA, which**
6 **approved the installation of a wireless telecommunications facility consisting of ten**
7 **panel antennae, for a proposed project at 590 Second Avenue.**

8
9 WHEREAS, On January 28, 2021, the Planning Commission adopted Motion No.
10 20849 approving a Conditional Use Authorization, identified as Planning Case No. 2019-
11 015984CUA, to install a new rooftop AT&T mobility macro wireless telecommunications facility
12 consisting of installation of 10 panel antennae and ancillary equipment as part of the AT&T
13 mobility telecommunications network for a proposed project located at 590 Second Avenue,
14 Assessor’s Parcel Block No. 1544, Lot No. 026; and

15 WHEREAS, On March 1, 2021, Ann Green, on behalf of property owners affected by
16 the Conditional Use Authorization or located within 300 feet of the subject property, filed a
17 timely appeal protesting the approval by the Planning Commission; and

18 WHEREAS, On March 23, 2021, the Board of Supervisors (“Board”) held a duly noticed
19 public hearing on the appeal of the approval of the Conditional Use Authorization; and

20 WHEREAS, Following the conclusion of the public hearing, the Board voted by a vote
21 of 11-0 to conditionally disapprove the decision of the Planning Commission and deny the
22 issuance of the requested Conditional Use Authorization; and

23 WHEREAS, In deciding the appeal, the Board reviewed and considered the entire
24 written record before the Board, which is on file with the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors in
25

1 File No. 210240, and all the public comments made in support of and in opposition to the
2 appeal; now, therefore, be it

3 MOVED, That the Board finds that:

4 (1) The written and oral information submitted by the project sponsor was not
5 persuasive or objectively verified, and the project sponsor was unable to demonstrate credibly
6 that the proposed wireless facility is necessary or desirable for, and compatible with, the
7 neighborhood or the community.

8 (2) Notwithstanding representations made by the project sponsor that the project is
9 necessary to support first responder efforts, the project sponsor failed to verify these
10 representations.

11 (3) Written and oral information submitted into the record establish that less
12 intrusive alternate locations for the wireless antennae exist, which locations would still enable
13 the applicant to meet its service needs.

14 (4) The public testimony at the hearing and the documentation submitted in support
15 of the appeal showed that the project will not be desirable for or compatible with the
16 neighborhood in light of the size and unsightliness of the structures that will be built to obscure
17 the wireless antennae, and the shadows those structures will cast on neighboring residential
18 properties.

19 (5) There is nothing in the record to suggest that the Board's decision to disapprove
20 the decision of the Planning Commission in this case would unreasonably discriminate against
21 the applicant in favor of providers of functionally equivalent terms.

22 (6) There is nothing in the record to suggest that the Board's decision to disapprove
23 the decision of the Planning commission in this case will limit or prohibit access to the
24 applicant's wireless telecommunications services in the geographic area of the propose site.
25

1 (7) There is nothing in the record to suggest that the Board's decision to disapprove
2 the decision of the Planning Commission in this case will prevent the applicant from filling a
3 significant gap in the wireless telecommunications services it is providing to remote users of
4 those services in the geographic area of the proposed site; and, be it

5 FURTHER MOVED, That the Board finds that based on the forgoing findings and the
6 entire record in Board File No. 210240, the proposed project will not be necessary or
7 desirable for, and compatible with, the neighborhood or the community; and, be it

8 FURTHER MOVED, That based on the foregoing findings and the entire record in
9 Board File No. 210240, the Board of Supervisors disapproved the decision of the Planning
10 Commission by its Motion No. 20849, and denied the Conditional Use Authorization.

11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25



City and County of San Francisco

Tails

Motion: M21-075

City Hall
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

File Number: 210471

Date Passed: May 04, 2021

Motion adopting findings in support of the Board of Supervisors' disapproval of the decision of the Planning Commission by its Motion No. 20849, regarding the Conditional Use Authorization identified as Planning Case No. 2019-015984CUA, which approved the installation of a wireless telecommunications facility consisting of ten panel antennae, for a proposed project at 590 Second Avenue.

May 04, 2021 Board of Supervisors - APPROVED

Ayes: 11 - Chan, Haney, Mandelman, Mar, Melgar, Peskin, Preston, Ronen, Safai, Stefani and Walton

File No. 210471

I hereby certify that the foregoing Motion was APPROVED on 5/4/2021 by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco.


Angela Calvillo
Clerk of the Board