

File No. 210699 Committee Item No. 3
 Board Item No. 33

COMMITTEE/BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
 AGENDA PACKET CONTENTS LIST

Committee: Land Use and Transportation Committee Date October 14, 2021

Board of Supervisors Meeting Date October 26, 2021

Cmte Board

- | | | |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Motion |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Resolution |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Ordinance |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Legislative Digest |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Budget and Legislative Analyst Report |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Youth Commission Report |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Introduction Form |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Department/Agency Cover Letter and/or Report |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | MOU |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Grant Information Form |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Grant Budget |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Subcontract Budget |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Contract/Agreement |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Form 126 – Ethics Commission |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Award Letter |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Application |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Public Correspondence |

OTHER (Use back side if additional space is needed)

- | | | |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Referral CEQA 062221 |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Referral PC 062221 |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Referral FYI 062221 |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | CEQA Determination 072221 |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | PLN Transmittal 092021 |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Referral FYI 101221 |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Referral PC 101221 |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Referral CEQA 101221 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | _____ |

Completed by: Erica Major Date October 14, 2021
 Completed by: Erica Major Date October 20, 2021

1 [Planning, Administrative Codes - Accessory Dwelling Units]

2

3 **Ordinance amending the Planning Code to clarify the requirements for applications to**
4 **construct Accessory Dwelling Units under the City’s local Accessory Dwelling Unit**
5 **approval process; amending the Administrative Code to clarify that landlords may not**
6 **remove certain tenant housing services without just cause and that issuance of a**
7 **building permit does not constitute just cause; making findings as required by the**
8 **Tenant Protection Act of 2019; affirming the Planning Department’s determination**
9 **under the California Environmental Quality Act; and making findings of consistency**
10 **with the General Plan, and the eight priority policies of Planning Code, Section 101.1.**

11 NOTE: **Unchanged Code text and uncodified text** are in plain Arial font.
12 **Additions to Codes** are in *single-underline italics Times New Roman font*.
13 **Deletions to Codes** are in *strikethrough italics Times New Roman font*.
14 **Board amendment additions** are in double-underlined Arial font.
15 **Board amendment deletions** are in ~~strikethrough Arial font~~.
16 **Asterisks (* * * *)** indicate the omission of unchanged Code
17 subsections or parts of tables.

18 Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

19 Section 1. Findings.

20 (a) The Planning Department has determined that the actions contemplated in this
21 ordinance comply with the California Environmental Quality Act (California Public Resources
22 Code Sections 21000 et seq.). Said determination is on file with the Clerk of the Board of
23 Supervisors in File No. 210699 and is incorporated herein by reference. The Board affirms
24 this determination.

25 (b) On September 9, 2021, the Planning Commission, in Resolution No. 20986,
adopted findings that the actions contemplated in this ordinance are consistent, on balance,

1 with the City's General Plan and eight priority policies of Planning Code Section 101.1. The
2 Board adopts these findings as its own. A copy of said Resolution is on file with the Clerk of
3 the Board of Supervisors in File No. 210699, and is incorporated herein by reference.

4 (c) This ordinance is intended in part to clarify the existing rules in the Rent Ordinance
5 as to housing services. The term housing services refers to services provided by the landlord
6 connected with the use or occupancy of a rental unit including, but not limited to, access to
7 areas such as garages, driveways, storage spaces, laundry rooms, decks, patios, gardens on
8 the same lot, and kitchen facilities or lobbies in single room occupancy (SRO) hotels. This
9 ordinance clarifies that landlords may not sever, remove, or reduce housing services without
10 just cause, and that this rule applies equally to landlords who intend to construct Accessory
11 Dwelling Units. These landlords must comply with just cause rules, and being in possession
12 of a building permit does not, in and of itself, confer just cause to sever a housing service. By
13 clarifying that the just cause rules in the Rent Ordinance apply, this ordinance is more
14 protective than the Tenant Protection Act of 2019 (Cal. Civ. Code § 1946.2), as the Rent
15 Ordinance further limits the reasons for termination of a residential tenancy, provides for
16 higher relocation assistance amounts, and provides additional tenant protections.

17
18 Section 2. Article 2 of the Planning Code is hereby amended by revising Section 207,
19 to read as follows:

20 **SEC. 207. DWELLING UNIT DENSITY LIMITS.**

21 * * * *

22 (c) **Exceptions to Dwelling Unit Density Limits.** An exception to the calculations
23 under this Section 207 shall be made in the following circumstances:

24 * * * *

1 (4) Local Accessory Dwelling Unit Program: Accessory Dwelling Units
2 in Multifamily Buildings; Accessory Dwelling Units in Single-Family Homes That Do Not
3 Strictly Meet the Requirements in subsection (c)(6).

4 * * * *

5 (C) Controls on Construction. An Accessory Dwelling Unit regulated
6 by this subsection (c)(4) is permitted to be constructed in an existing or proposed building
7 under the following conditions:

8 (i) For lots that have four existing Dwelling Units or fewer or
9 where the zoning would permit the construction of four or fewer Dwelling Units, one ADU is
10 permitted; for lots that have more than four existing Dwelling Units or are undergoing seismic
11 retrofitting under subsection (c)(4)(F) below, or where the zoning would permit the
12 construction of more than four Dwelling Units, there is no limit on the number of ADUs
13 permitted, ~~provided, however, that~~

14 (ii) ~~The~~ Department shall not approve an application for
15 construction of an ADU where a tenant on the lot has been evicted pursuant to Administrative
16 Code Sections 37.9(a)(9) through (a)(12) and 37.9(a)(14) under a notice of eviction served
17 within 10 years prior to filing the application for a building permit to construct the ADU or
18 where a tenant has been evicted pursuant to Administrative Code Section 37.9(a)(8) under a
19 notice of eviction served within five years prior to filing the application for a building permit to
20 construct the ADU. This ~~provision~~ subsection (c)(4)(C)(ii) shall not apply if the tenant was evicted
21 under Section 37.9(a)(11) or 37.9(a)(14) and the applicant(s) either (A) have certified that the
22 original tenant reoccupied the unit after the temporary eviction or (B) have submitted to the
23 Department and to the Residential Rent Stabilization and Arbitration Board (Rent Board) a
24 declaration from the property owner or the tenant certifying that the property owner notified
25 the tenant of the tenant’s right to reoccupy the unit and the tenant chose not to reoccupy it.

1 (iii) Prior to submitting an application to construct an ADU under this
2 subsection (c)(4), the property owner shall file with the Rent Board a written declaration, signed under
3 penalty of perjury, demonstrating that the project will comply with the requirements of Administrative
4 Code Sections 37.2(r) and 37.9 relating to severance, substantial reduction, or removal of a housing
5 service. The Rent Board shall determine the form and content of said declaration, which shall include
6 the following information: (1) a description of any housing services supplied in connection with the use
7 or occupancy of any units on the subject property that are located in the area of the property or
8 building where the ADU would be constructed; (2) whether construction of the ADU would result in the
9 severance, substantial reduction, or removal of any such housing services; and (3) whether any of the
10 just causes for eviction under Administrative Code Section 37.9(a) would apply. The property owner
11 shall also file a copy of the notice required under Section 207(c)(4)(J) with the declaration.

12 (iv) Tenants at the subject property may contest the information in the
13 declaration required by subsection 207(c)(4)(C)(iii) by petitioning for a written determination from the
14 Rent Board verifying the presence and defining characteristics of the housing service or services in
15 question, and whether any such housing services would be severed, substantially reduced, or removed
16 by the project as proposed. Petitions must be filed with the Rent Board within 30 calendar days after
17 the notice required under subsection 207(c)(4)(J) has been provided. If no such petition is timely filed,
18 the Rent Board shall promptly transmit the declaration to the Planning Department. If any such
19 petition is timely filed, the Rent Board shall endeavor to transmit the declaration and its final written
20 determination on the petition to the Planning Department within 90 calendar days of receipt of said
21 petition. The Department shall not approve an application to construct an ADU under this subsection
22 (c)(4) unless (1) the Rent Board has transmitted the declaration and final written determination
23 required by subsections (c)(4)(C)(iii) and (c)(4)(C)(iv), and (2) the materials transmitted by the Rent
24 Board indicate that construction of the ADU would not result in the severance, substantial reduction,
25 or removal without just cause of any tenant housing service set forth in Administrative Code Section

1 37.2(r) that is supplied in the area of the property or building where the ADU would be constructed,
2 unless the property owner demonstrates that the tenant supplied with that housing service has given
3 their express written consent for the severance, substantial reduction, or removal of the housing
4 service.

5 (iv) Except as provided in subsections (iii) and (vii) below, an
6 Accessory Dwelling Unit shall be constructed entirely within the buildable area of an existing
7 lot, provided that the ADU does not exceed the existing height of an existing building, or within
8 the built envelope of an existing and authorized stand-alone garage, storage structure, or
9 other auxiliary structure on the same lot, as the built envelope existed three years prior to the
10 time the application was filed for a building permit to construct the ADU. For purposes of this
11 ~~provision-subsection (c)(4)(C)(v)~~, the “built envelope” shall include the open area under a
12 cantilevered room or room built on columns; decks, except for decks that are supported by
13 columns or walls other than the building wall to which they are attached and are multi-level or
14 more than 10 feet above grade; and lightwell infills provided that the infill will be against a
15 blank neighboring wall at the property line and not visible from any off-site location; as these
16 spaces existed as of July 11, 2016. An ADU constructed entirely within the existing built
17 envelope, as defined in this subsection ~~(ii)~~, along with permitted obstructions allowed in
18 Section 136(c)(32), of an existing building or authorized auxiliary structure on the same lot, or
19 where an existing stand-alone garage or storage structure has been expanded to add
20 dormers, is exempt from the notification requirements of Section 311 of this Code unless the
21 existing building or authorized auxiliary structure on the same lot is in an Article 10 or Article
22 11 District, in which case the notification requirements will apply. If an ADU will be constructed
23 under a cantilevered room or deck that encroaches into the required rear yard, a pre-
24 application meeting between the applicant and adjacent neighbors for all the proposed work is
25 required before the application may be submitted.

1 (iii) When a stand-alone garage, storage, or other auxiliary
2 structure is being converted to an ADU, an expansion to the envelope is allowed to add
3 dormers even if the stand-alone garage, storage structure, or other auxiliary structure is in the
4 required rear yard.

5 (iv) On a corner lot, a legal stand-alone nonconforming garage,
6 storage structure, or other auxiliary structure may be expanded within its existing footprint by
7 up to one additional story in order to create a consistent street wall and improve the continuity
8 of buildings on the block.

9 (v) An Accessory Dwelling Unit shall not be constructed using
10 space from an existing Dwelling Unit except that an ADU may expand into habitable space on
11 the ground or basement floors provided that it does not exceed 25% of the gross square
12 footage of such space. The Zoning Administrator may waive this 25% limitation if (a) the
13 resulting space would not be usable or would be impractical to use for other reasonable uses
14 included but not limited to storage or bicycle parking or (b) waiving the limitation would help
15 relieve any negative layout issues for the proposed ADU.

16 (vi) An existing building undergoing seismic retrofitting may be
17 eligible for a height increase pursuant to subsection (c)(4)(F) below.

18 (vii) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Code, an
19 Accessory Dwelling Unit authorized under this ~~Section 207~~ subsection (c)(4) may not be merged
20 with an original unit(s).

21 (viii) An Accessory Dwelling Unit shall not be permitted in any
22 building in a Neighborhood Commercial District or in the Chinatown Community Business or
23 Visitor Retail Districts if it would eliminate or reduce a ground-story retail or commercial space,
24 unless the Accessory Dwelling Unit is a Designated Child Care Unit, as defined in Section
25 102, and meets all applicable standards of Planning Code Section 414A.6(e).

1 (r) Rental Units. All residential dwelling units in the City and County of San Francisco
2 together with the land and appurtenant buildings thereto, and all housing services, privileges,
3 furnishings, and facilities supplied in connection with the use or occupancy thereof, including
4 garage and parking facilities.

5 Garage facilities, parking facilities, driveways, storage spaces, laundry rooms, decks,
6 patios, or gardens on the same lot, or kitchen facilities or lobbies in single room occupancy
7 (SRO) hotels, supplied in connection with the use or occupancy of a unit, may not be severed
8 from the tenancy by the landlord without just cause as required by Section 37.9(a). Any
9 severance, substantial reduction or removal of a housing service, even if permitted under ~~this~~
10 ~~Section 37.2(r)~~ Section 37.9(a), shall be offset by a corresponding reduction in rent. Either a
11 landlord or a tenant may file a petition with the Rent Board to determine the amount of the rent
12 reduction. In addition, a tenant may petition the Rent Board for a determination on whether an
13 Accessory Dwelling Unit proposed to be constructed under Planning Code Section 207(c)(4) would
14 sever, substantially reduce, or remove a housing service, pursuant to the procedures set forth in
15 subsection 207(c)(4)(C)(iii). The issuance of a permit for construction of an Accessory Dwelling Unit
16 does not, in and of itself, constitute a just cause for the purpose of severing a housing service.

17 * * * *

18 **SEC. 37.9. EVICTIONS.**

19 Notwithstanding Section 37.3, this Section 37.9 shall apply as of August 24, 1980, to
20 all landlords and tenants of rental units as defined in Section 37.2(r).

21 * * * *

22 (f) Whenever a landlord wrongfully endeavors to recover possession or recovers
23 possession of a rental unit in violation of Sections 37.9 and/or 37.10A as enacted herein, or
24 wrongfully endeavors to sever, substantially reduce, or remove, or actually severs, substantially
25 reduces, or removes a housing service supplied in connection with the use or occupancy of a rental unit

1 as set forth in Section 37.2(r), the tenant or Rent Board may institute a civil proceeding for
2 injunctive relief, money damages of not less than three times actual damages (including
3 damages for mental or emotional distress as specified below), and whatever other relief the
4 court deems appropriate. If the landlord has recovered possession pursuant to Section
5 37.9(a)(8), such action shall be brought no later than five years after (1) the date the landlord
6 files the first statement of occupancy with the Rent Board under Section 37.9(a)(8)(vii) or (2)
7 three months after the landlord recovers possession, whichever is earlier. In the case of an
8 award of damages for mental or emotional distress, said award shall only be trebled if the trier
9 of fact finds that the landlord acted in knowing violation of or in reckless disregard of Section
10 37.9 or 37.10A herein. The prevailing party shall be entitled to reasonable attorney's fees and
11 costs pursuant to order of the court. The remedy available under this Section 37.9(f) shall be
12 in addition to any other existing remedies which may be available to the tenant or the Rent
13 Board.

14 * * * *

15
16 Section 4. Effective Date. This ordinance shall become effective 30 days after
17 enactment. Enactment occurs when the Mayor signs the ordinance, the Mayor returns the
18 ordinance unsigned or does not sign the ordinance within ten days of receiving it, or the Board
19 of Supervisors overrides the Mayor's veto of the ordinance.

20
21 Section 5. Scope of Ordinance. In enacting this ordinance, the Board of Supervisors
22 intends to amend only those words, phrases, paragraphs, subsections, sections, articles,
23 numbers, punctuation marks, charts, diagrams, or any other constituent parts of the Municipal
24 Code that are explicitly shown in this ordinance as additions, deletions, Board amendment
25

1 additions, and Board amendment deletions in accordance with the “Note” that appears under
2 the official title of the ordinance.

3

4 APPROVED AS TO FORM:
5 DENNIS J. HERRERA, City Attorney

6 By: /s/ Peter R. Miljanich
7 PETER R. MILJANICH
8 Deputy City Attorney

9 n:\legana\as2021\2100393\01558796.docx

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

REVISED LEGISLATIVE DIGEST

(Substituted, 10/5/2021)

[Planning, Administrative Codes - Accessory Dwelling Units]

Ordinance amending the Planning Code to clarify the requirements for applications to construct Accessory Dwelling Units under the City's local Accessory Dwelling Unit approval process; amending the Administrative Code to clarify that landlords may not remove certain tenant housing services without just cause and that issuance of a building permit does not constitute just cause; making findings as required by the Tenant Protection Act of 2019; affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act; and making findings of consistency with the General Plan, and the eight priority policies of Planning Code, Section 101.1.

Existing Law

Planning Code subsection 207(c)(4) sets forth the City's discretionary local approval process for accessory dwelling unit (ADU) projects that are not eligible for state-mandated, ministerial consideration by the City.

Chapter 37 of the Administrative Code (the City's Residential Rent Stabilization and Arbitration Ordinance, or Rent Ordinance) protects tenants in certain rental units from evictions without just cause. Under Rent Ordinance section 37.2(r), a rental unit includes all housing services, privileges, furnishings, and facilities supplied in connection with the use or occupancy thereof, including garage and parking facilities. Such housing services may not be severed from a tenancy without just cause, as required by Rent Ordinance section 37.9. The issuance of a permit for construction of an Accessory Dwelling Unit does not in and of itself constitute a just cause for the purpose of severing, reducing, or removing a housing service.

Amendments to Current Law

This ordinance would require project sponsors seeking to construct an ADU under Planning Code subsection 207(c)(4) to submit a written declaration, signed under penalty of perjury, to the San Francisco Rent Stabilization and Arbitration Board (Rent Board) that the project will comply with the requirements of Administrative Code Sections 37.2(r) and 37.9 relating to severance, substantial reduction, or removal of certain housing services. This ordinance would require the Rent Board to determine the form and content of the declaration, which shall include, at minimum, the following information:

- (1) A description of any housing services supplied in connection with the use or occupancy of any units on the subject property that are located in the area of the property or building where the ADU would be constructed;

- (2) Whether construction of the ADU would result in the severance, substantial reduction, or removal of any such housing services; and
- (3) The just cause for the severance, substantial reduction, or removal of such housing services.

The ordinance would allow tenants at the subject property to contest the information in the declaration by petitioning for a written determination from the Rent Board verifying the presence and defining characteristics of the housing service or services in question, and whether any such housing services would be severed, substantially reduced, or removed by the project as proposed. If no petition is timely filed, the ordinance would require the Rent Board to transmit the declaration to the Planning Department promptly. If a petition is timely filed, the ordinance would require the Rent Board to endeavor to transmit the declaration to the Planning Department within 90 days of receiving the petition.

The Planning Department would no longer be authorized to approve an application to construct an ADU under subsection (c)(4) unless (1) the Department has received the declaration or final written determination from the Rent Board, and (2) the declaration and final written determination indicate that construction of the ADU would not result in severance, substantial reduction, or removal of any tenant housing service that is supplied in the area of the property or building where the ADU would be constructed without just cause, unless the property owner demonstrates that the tenant supplied with that housing service has given their express written consent for the severance, substantial reduction, or removal of the housing service.

This ordinance also sets forth additional tenant notification requirements for applications to construct an ADU under subsection 207(c)(4).

This ordinance amends Rent Ordinance sections 37.2(r) and 37.9 to clarify existing law that the issuance of a permit for construction of an ADU does not in and of itself constitute a just cause for the purpose of severing a housing service.

Background Information

San Francisco first enacted a local ADU ordinance in 2015 and has updated its ADU program several times since then, both in response to amendments to State law and also to facilitate the construction of ADUs under the City's local program.

n:\legana\as2021\2100393\01558831.docx



September 20, 2021

Ms. Angela Calvillo, Clerk
Honorable Supervisors Mandelman, Ronen, Preston, and Melgar
Board of Supervisors
City and County of San Francisco
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102

Re: Transmittal of Planning Department Case Number 2021-006365PCA
Accessory Dwelling Units
Board File No. 210699

Planning Commission Recommendation: Approval

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisors Mandelman, Ronen, Preston, and Melgar,

On September 9, 2021, the Planning Commission conducted a duly noticed public hearing at a regularly scheduled meeting to consider the proposed Ordinance, introduced by Supervisors Mandelman that would amend the Planning Code to clarify the requirements for applications to construct Accessory Dwelling Units under the City's local Accessory Dwelling Unit approval process; amending the Administrative Code to clarify that landlords may not remove tenant housing services without just cause and that issuance of a building permit does not constitute just cause. At the hearing the Planning Commission recommended approval.

Please find attached documents relating to the actions of the Commission. If you have any questions or require further information, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

Aaron D. Starr
Manager of Legislative Affairs

cc: Peter Miljanich, Deputy City Attorney
Jacob Bintliff, Aide to Supervisor Mandelman
Erica Major, Office of the Clerk of the Board

Attachments :

Planning Commission Resolution

Planning Department Executive Summary



PLANNING COMMISSION RESOLUTION NO. 20986

HEARING DATE: SEPTEMBER 9, 2021

Project Name: Accessory Dwelling Units
Case Number: 2021-006353PCA [Board File No. 210699]
Initiated by: Supervisors Mandelman, Ronen, Preston, and Melgar / Introduced June 15, 2021
Staff Contact: Veronica Flores, Legislative Affairs
veronica.flores@sfgov.org, (628) 652-7525
Reviewed by: Aaron D Starr, Manager of Legislative Affairs
aaron.starr@sfgov.org, (628) 652-7533

RESOLUTION APPROVING A PROPOSED ORDINANCE THAT WOULD AMEND THE PLANNING CODE TO CLARIFY THE REQUIREMENTS FOR APPLICATIONS TO CONSTRUCT ACCESSORY DWELLING UNITS UNDER THE CITY'S LOCAL ACCESSORY DWELLING UNIT APPROVAL PROCESS; ADOPTING A RECOMMENDATION FOR APPROVAL OF AN AMENDMENT TO THE ADMINISTRATIVE CODE TO CLARIFY THAT LANDLORDS MAY NOT REMOVE TENANT HOUSING SERVICES WITHOUT JUST CAUSE AND THAT ISSUANCE OF A BUILDING PERMIT DOES NOT CONSTITUTE JUST CAUSE; MAKING FINDINGS AS REQUIRED BY THE TENANT PROTECTION ACT OF 2019; AFFIRMING THE PLANNING DEPARTMENT'S DETERMINATION UNDER THE CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT; AND MAKING FINDINGS OF CONSISTENCY WITH THE GENERAL PLAN, AND THE EIGHT PRIORITY POLICIES OF PLANNING CODE, SECTION 101.1.

WHEREAS, on June 15, 2021 Supervisors, Mandelman, Ronen, and Preston introduced a proposed Ordinance under Board of Supervisors (hereinafter "Board") File Number 210699, which would amend the Planning Code to clarify the requirements for applications to construct Accessory Dwelling Units under the City's local Accessory Dwelling Unit approval process; amending the Administrative Code to clarify that landlords may not remove tenant housing services without just cause and that issuance of a building permit does not constitute just cause; making findings as required by the Tenant Protection Act of 2019;

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission (hereinafter "Commission") conducted a duly noticed public hearing at a regularly scheduled meeting to consider the proposed Ordinance on September 9, 2021; and,

WHEREAS, the proposed Ordinance has been determined to be categorically exempt from environmental review under the California Environmental Quality Act Section 15060(c)(2) and 15378; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission has heard and considered the testimony presented to it at the public hearing and has further considered written materials and oral testimony presented on behalf of Department staff and other interested parties; and

WHEREAS, all pertinent documents may be found in the files of the Department, as the Custodian of Records, at 49 South Van Ness Avenue, Suite 1400, San Francisco; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission has reviewed the proposed Ordinance; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission finds from the facts presented that the public necessity, convenience, and general welfare require the proposed amendment; and

MOVED, that the Planning Commission hereby **ap**proves the proposed ordinance.

Findings

Having reviewed the materials identified in the preamble above, and having heard all testimony and arguments, this Commission finds, concludes, and determines as follows:

1. The Commission finds that the proposed Ordinance supports the Housing Element's goals to ensure adequate housing for current and future San Franciscans by increasing the potential for new Accessory Dwelling Units.
2. The Commission finds that the proposed will further protect existing tenants' rights.

General Plan Compliance

The proposed Ordinance is consistent with the following Objectives and Policies of the General Plan:

HOUSING ELEMENT

OBJECTIVE 1

IDENTIFY AND MAKE AVAILABLE FOR DEVELOPMENT ADEQUATE SITES TO MEET THE CITY'S HOUSING NEEDS, ESPECIALLY PERMANENTLY AFFORDABLE HOUSING.

Policy 1.5

Consider secondary units in community plans where there is neighborhood support and when other neighborhood goals can be achieved, especially if that housing is made permanently affordable to lower-income households.

OBJECTIVE 3

PROTECT THE AFFORDABILITY OF THE EXISTING HOUSING STOCK, ESPECIALLY RENTAL UNITS.

Policy 3.4

Preserve “naturally affordable” housing types, such as smaller and older ownership units.

The General Plan identifies ADUs as an effective and inexpensive way to increase the housing supply. The Ordinance retains existing housing units and prioritizes permanently affordable housing. Additionally, the proposed amendments would expand protections for existing tenants.

Planning Code Section 101 Findings

The proposed amendments to the Planning Code are consistent with the eight Priority Policies set forth in Section 101.1(b) of the Planning Code in that:

1. That existing neighborhood-serving retail uses be preserved and enhanced and future opportunities for resident employment in and ownership of such businesses enhanced;

The proposed Ordinance would not have a negative effect on neighborhood serving retail uses and will not have a negative effect on opportunities for resident employment in and ownership of neighborhood-serving retail.

2. That existing housing and neighborhood character be conserved and protected in order to preserve the cultural and economic diversity of our neighborhoods;

The proposed Ordinance would not have a negative effect on housing or neighborhood character.

3. That the City’s supply of affordable housing be preserved and enhanced;

The proposed Ordinance would not have an adverse effect on the City’s supply of affordable housing.

4. That commuter traffic not impede MUNI transit service or overburden our streets or neighborhood parking;

The proposed Ordinance would not result in commuter traffic impeding MUNI transit service or overburdening the streets or neighborhood parking.

5. That a diverse economic base be maintained by protecting our industrial and service sectors from displacement due to commercial office development, and that future opportunities for resident employment and ownership in these sectors be enhanced;

The proposed Ordinance would not cause displacement of the industrial or service sectors due to office development, and future opportunities for resident employment or ownership in these sectors would not be impaired.

6. That the City achieve the greatest possible preparedness to protect against injury and loss of life in an earthquake;

The proposed Ordinance would not have an adverse effect on City’s preparedness against injury and loss

of life in an earthquake.

7. That the landmarks and historic buildings be preserved;

The proposed Ordinance would not have an adverse effect on the City's Landmarks and historic buildings.

8. That our parks and open space and their access to sunlight and vistas be protected from development;

The proposed Ordinance would not have an adverse effect on the City's parks and open space and their access to sunlight and vistas.

Planning Code Section 302 Findings.

The Planning Commission finds from the facts presented that the public necessity, convenience and general welfare require the proposed amendments to the Planning Code as set forth in Section 302.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Commission hereby APPROVES the proposed Ordinance as described in this Resolution.

I hereby certify that the foregoing Resolution was adopted by the Commission at its meeting on September 9, 2021.



Jonas P Ionin Digitally signed by Jonas P Ionin
Date: 2021.09.17 10:47:02 -07'00'

Jonas P. Ionin
Commission Secretary

AYES: Tanner, Diamond, Fung, Imperial, Moore, Koppel

NOES: None

ABSENT: Chan

ADOPTED: September 9, 2021



EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

PLANNING AND ADMINISTRATIVE CODE TEXT AMENDMENT

HEARING DATE: September 9, 2021

90-Day Deadline: September 20, 2021

Project Name: Accessory Dwelling Units
Case Number: 2021-006353PCA [Board File No. 210699]
Initiated by: Supervisor Mandelman / Introduced June 22, 2021
Staff Contact: Veronica Flores, Legislative Affairs
veronica.flores@sfgov.org, (628) 652-7525
Reviewed by: Aaron D Starr, Manager of Legislative Affairs
aaron.starr@sfgov.org, (628) 652-7533

Recommendation: Approval with Modifications

Planning Code Amendment

Ordinance amending the Planning Code to clarify the requirements for applications to construct Accessory Dwelling Units under the City’s local Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) approval process; amending the Administrative Code to clarify that landlords may not remove tenant housing services without just cause and that issuance of a building permit does not constitute just cause; making findings as required by the Tenant Protection Act of 2019.

The Way It Is Now:	The Way It Would Be:
<p>PLANNING CODE</p> <p>There is no written declaration requirement under the Local ADU Program.</p>	<p>Property owners would be required to submit a written declaration to Rent Board regarding description of housing services that are located where the ADU(s) are proposed; whether ADU construction would result in severance, reduction, or removal of housing services; and the just cause for the previously mentioned.</p>

	<p>Rent Board would then need to submit their determination to Planning within 30 days. Planning would not be able to approve an ADU under the Local Program if either 1) the applicant’s declaration is missing or 2) the declaration indicates that the ADU construction would result in severance, reduction, or removal of housing services supplied in the area of the property where the ADU is proposed without just cause.</p>
<p>There is no notification requirement under the Local ADU Program.</p>	<p>All ADUs under the Local Program would also now require a 15-day notice posted at property prior to submittal of a building permit application, similar to what is sometimes required by the Department of Building Inspection (DBI) Screening Form and what is required for single-family dwellings under Section 207(c)(6).</p>
<p>ADMINISTRATIVE CODE</p>	
<p>The Administrative Code is ambiguous in terms of construction of an ADU being just cause or not for the purpose of severing a housing service.</p>	<p>The Ordinance would clarify that the issuance of a permit for construction of an ADU does not in and of itself constitute a just cause for the purpose of severing a housing service.</p>

Anticipated Amendments

Supervisor Mandelman intends to reintroduce the Ordinance with a few minor amendments that will provide additional grievance paths to tenants and to further clarify the noticing requirements. A summary of the proposed additional amendments is included below:

- Tenants would have an opportunity to contest the information provided in the declaration and petition the Rent Board for a written determination verifying the presence and defining characteristics of the housing service(s) in question. If no petition is filed, Rent Board would have 30 days to transmit the declaration to Planning Department. If a petition is filed, Rent Board would have 90 days to transmit the declaration and their written determination to the Planning Department.
 - The Rent Board determination shall also consider if the reduction of a housing service is substantial or not.
 - Planning Department would be able to approve a proposed ADU application that would sever, reduce, or removal housing services without just cause if the tenant has given their express written consent for severance, reduction, or removal of said housing service.
- Applicants would be required to include a copy of the written declaration in the posted and mailed notices.

Background

San Francisco first adopted a local ADU program in 2014 and made several updates since the initial inception both in response to changes to the State law and to improve the City's local ADU program. The most recent ADU changes enacted prior to this Ordinance occurred in 2019, which allowed ADUs in new construction. More recently, there were changes to the State law that came before the Historic Preservation and Planning Commissions in November 2020 and again this month. That recent Ordinance covered changes prescribed in Section 3 of [Senate Bill 13](#), Section 2 of [Assembly Bill 68](#), Section 1.5 of [Assembly Bill 881](#), and [Assembly Bill 3182](#). This Ordinance expands on these past efforts by ensuring that existing tenants' rights are protected. Specifically, the Ordinance would ensure that no housing services are severed, reduced, or removed as part of the construction of an ADU, unless agreed to by said tenant(s).

Issues and Considerations

Housing Services

A housing service is defined by the Administrative Code as services provided by the landlord connected with the use of the rental unit. These need to be included in an agreement between the landlord and the tenant. Common examples of housing services include an off-street parking space, a laundry facility, or a storage space. These amenities are often noted in plan sets, but not explicitly noted as a housing service as part of an agreement between the landlord and tenant.

The Planning Department is unable to confirm if something is a “housing service”. The Rent Board is unable to confirm if the construction of an ADU is impacting a “housing service”.

The Rent Board currently reviews tenant appeals and provides a factual report of their findings. An example of this includes confirming if a housing service is in fact present and where it is located within the building. The Rent Board currently also reviews and determines if housing services are relocated and replaced without substantial reduction. However, the Rent Board does not determine if housing services are lost due to the construction of an ADU. As written, the Ordinance puts the onus of determining if a housing service would be lost due to the construction of an ADU on the Planning Department, even though Rent Board determines what constitutes a housing service. Supervisor Mandelman's anticipated amendments seek to resolve this information gap by having the Rent Board expand their factual findings to determine if housing services would be lost due to the construction of an ADU.

Existing Tenant Protections

Landlords are legally bound to provide housing services noted in agreements with their tenants. Landlords may replace housing services so long as they are not a substantial reduction of the existing housing service. There is an internal Planning Department policy that laundry facilities should be maintained. Laundry facilities can be relocated within the building so long as the laundry facility quality is retained or improved. For example, a communal laundry facility area can be relocated to a different part of the building, or alternatively, removed altogether if the property owner provides individual in-unit laundry facilities for all the affected tenants. In the latter case, the proposed in-unit laundry is an upgrade compared to the existing common laundry facility housing service. Tenants can work with the Rent Board for official determinations on what would be considered in-kind replacements of existing housing services.

Landlords and tenants may arrive to an agreement regarding the removal of housing services; however, that does not address potential displacement impacts. For example, a landlord must reduce the rent in exchange for their access to a parking space; however, the tenant may still ultimately decide that they need a parking space and look for a new home with this housing service elsewhere. In this case, the Ordinance would protect the housing service or require an appropriate reduction in rent, if tenant agrees; however, the Ordinance may inadvertently force tenants to move if the tenant later decides they need such housing service.

As written, the Ordinance is ambiguous if the landlord and tenant come to an agreement regarding the loss of a housing service and whether the Planning Department can approve an ADU. One of Supervisor Mandelman's anticipated amendments explicitly notes that if a tenant consents to the severance, reduction, or removal of a housing service then Planning Department would be able to approve a proposed ADU. This resolves any ambiguities between the parties and still provides a path to creating additional ADU(s).

Just Cause

Just cause evictions are evictions in which there is a breach in contract by the tenant. Some examples of just cause evictions include non-payment of rent, habitual late payments, or an unapproved subtenant. Other examples of just cause evictions for which the tenant has a right to relocation payments include owner move-in, sale of a unit which has been converted to a condominium, or substantial renovation of the building. The Rent Ordinance is ambiguous on the construction of an ADU and whether it is considered just cause for eviction. The proposed Ordinance clarifies that the construction of an ADU itself does not constitute a just cause for eviction.

Noticing and Review Time

Adding an ADU under the Local Program does not currently require noticing unless a building expansion that triggers neighborhood notification is proposed as part of the ADU. In addition, some proposed ADUs under the Local ADU Program require notification to tenants per the DBI [Screening Form](#). The proposed Ordinance seeks to strengthen the notification requirements so that all tenants are notified up front about the construction of an ADU and whether housing services are removed. Applicants would also be required to submit a declaration to the Rent Board that includes a description of any housing services that would be removed because of the addition of the ADU. Most of the proposed ADU applications that the Department has reviewed do not remove a housing service. In these cases, the Rent Board would have 30 days to send the declaration to Planning and would be more procedural in nature. However, in the cases where a housing service is removed and a tenant petitions the Rent Board to verify said removal, the Rent Board would have 90 days to submit the declaration and their findings to the Planning Department.

While the Rent Board's review process is going on, Planning may begin their review of the ADU application; however, Planning may not approve the application until receipt of the Rent Board declaration and findings that housing services are not being removed. Depending on staff workload, this may cause unnecessary delays. While waiting for information from the Rent Board, staff may have moved on to review other projects, putting the ADU to the back of their workload. Delay concerns extend beyond the Planning Department since ADUs are now reviewed by all City agencies concurrently. This creates potential prioritization issues in deciding which ADU proposals to review first, not knowing if some ultimately would not be eligible to be approved pending the Rent Board declaration. Further, Rent Board appeals typically take months to be heard and resolved, likely beyond the 90 days Rent Board must provide Planning with the required materials.

Approval Paths and Rent Control

If enacted, the Ordinance would allow for ADUs under the Local ADU Program if 1) there is no removal of a housing service or 2) there is in-kind replacement of housing service that is not a substantial reduction. The anticipated amendments also create a third possible scenario that would allow for an ADU under the Local ADU Program: agreement between the landlord and tenant on the removal of the housing service and reduction in rent.

If the proposed ADU application does not comply with one of the above situations, then the proposal is not eligible for the Local ADU Program. The project sponsor may still be able to pursue an ADU under the State-Mandated ADU Program, but this option would likely result with fewer ADUs, and ADUs that are not subject to rent control. Alternatively, they could either 1) revise the proposal to not impact any housing services or 2) work with the tenant on agreeable terms to remove said housing service. These hypothetical scenarios are difficult to forecast, but if applicants pursue a State-Mandated ADU instead, then the City loses the opportunity for rent controlled units under the Local ADU Program. Based on recent Department data of active ADU projects, approximately 90 ADUs would not be approved under the Local ADU Program if this Ordinance were effective today. This data was determined based on projects where Planning is aware that the ADUs would impact housing services due to DBI's screening form or from Discretionary Review requests.

General Plan Compliance

The General Plan identifies ADUs as an effective and inexpensive way to increase the housing supply. The Ordinance retains existing housing units and prioritizes permanently affordable housing. Additionally, the proposed amendments would expand protections for existing tenants.

Racial and Social Equity Analysis

The Planning and Administrative Code amendments in the proposed Ordinance help protect existing tenants' rights. The ADU Programs have evolved so rapidly since the initial pilot program in the Castro. This is likely because the ADU program provides a quicker, and often more financially feasible path for property owners to add to the housing stock and different types of housing. However, the City needs to balance the desire for these ADUs with supporting existing tenants who may be impacted by the addition of an ADU.

Recent changes under State law allowed for more State-Mandated ADUs, potentially disproportionately impacting existing tenants compared to before. The proposed Ordinance seeks to protect existing tenants and their access to housing services. The majority of ADU proposals do not appear to remove housing services, but the proposed Ordinance provides additional support for tenants who believe their housing services are substantially reduced or removed without the appropriate rent adjustment. This gives renters, who typically do not have as much housing wealth as the landlord, an additional legal remedy through the declaration and opportunity to petition to the Rent Board.

Implementation

The Ordinance would yield major implementation impacts. Per recent pool of data, at least 90 ADUs would not be permitted under the Local Program if this legislation was effective. As noted above, this data point is only

based on the information the Department has, but it is still telling of the potential projects that might pursue the State-Mandated ADU Program.

The proposed Ordinance does not include any grandfathering clause and would immediately disqualify active ADU projects. Once enacted, existing projects would need to revise the proposal to retain existing housing services. Some project sponsors remove housing services to construct an ADU do go through the proper Rent Board mechanism to do so (i.e. reduction in rent for removal of parking). However, those project sponsors that are unwilling to do so may potentially pursue the State or Hybrid ADU Programs, if eligible. This would still result in an ADU but does not provide rent-controlled units.

As the proposed Ordinance is written today, the City would be relying on the owners' declaration. The anticipated amendments would require the Rent Board to expand their factual findings to determine if housing services would be lost due to the construction of an ADU, if a petition is received. This is a critical step in ensuring the appropriate agency is making this determination, especially since "housing services" are defined in the Administrative Code only. Without the anticipated amendments, the Planning Department is put in a difficult and awkward situation as the main point of contact for ADUs. Further, "housing services" are not identified on the plans so the Planning Department may not be able to accurately determine the "housing services", if any, as noted by the Rent Board. This information gap described earlier makes the Ordinance difficult to implement, which could negatively impact the existing tenants the legislation is meant to protect.

Lastly, this legislation does not address potential project revisions. There is no language proposed that prevents a project from being modified to later remove a housing service that would otherwise not be captured in the owner declaration to the Rent Board. This presents a major implementation impact to the Planning Department as the declaration to the Rent Board does not include accompanying plans and staff would be unable to confirm if the declaration is still valid. Further, if a Discretionary Review is filed on an ADU and it appears in front of the Planning Commission, the Planning Commission may be limited in how they modify the ADU if a housing service is present. This again creates a burden for implementation and may have unintended consequences that do not serve the existing tenants.

Recommendation

The Department recommends that the Commission *approve with modifications* the proposed Ordinance and adopt the attached Draft Resolution to that effect. The Department's proposed recommendations are as follows:

1. For ADUs under the Local Program where no housing services are removed and there are no tenant appeals, allow the applicant to submit proof of notification materials directly to Planning, without submitting a declaration to the Rent Board.
2. Allow the Planning Department to approve ADUs proposed under the Local ADU Program if the housing service proposed for removal is a parking space.

Basis for Recommendation

The Department supports the proposed Ordinance because it supports the Housing Element's goals to ensure adequate housing for current and future San Franciscans. Specifically, the Ordinance increases protections for

existing tenants. However, the Ordinance could further support our housing goals and San Francisco residents with the proposed modifications:

Recommendation 1: For ADUs under the Local Program where no housing services are removed and there are no tenant appeals, allow the applicant to submit proof of notification materials directly to Planning, without submitting a declaration to the Rent Board.

The Department's goal is to review proposed ADUs as expeditiously as possible. The majority of ADU proposals do not remove housing services or provide in-kind replacement if housing services are relocated. If enacted, the Ordinance would add an additional unnecessary step to ADU proposals that are not impacting existing tenants' rights. Instead, the applicant should be able to directly submit a copy of notification materials to the Planning Department which could save up to 30 days in review time. The Ordinance would best serve the public if it focused these additional declaration requirements on those proposed ADUs that are removing or substantially reducing housing services.

Recommendation 2: Allow the Planning Department to approve ADUs proposed under the Local ADU Program if the housing service proposed for removal is a parking space.

As written, all housing services are treated equally and the Planning Department is unable to approve a proposed ADU if it severs, substantially reduces, or removes any housing service. However, this may prevent potential ADUs from being built in opportune areas such as parking. The Department feels strongly that the City should strive to house people, not cars. Additionally, there is the concern that certain housing services such as parking are valued over rent controlled units and this should be remedied. This recommendation aligns with all other Department and City efforts to increase housing in San Francisco, while still protecting existing tenants' rights to certain housing services.

Required Commission Action

The proposed Ordinance is before the Commission so that it may approve it, reject it, or approve it with modifications.

Environmental Review

The proposed amendments are not defined as a project under CEQA Guidelines Section 15060(c)(2) and 15378 because they do not result in a physical change in the environment.

Public Comment

As of the date of this report, the Planning Department has not received any public comment regarding the proposed Ordinance.

Attachments:

- Exhibit A: Draft Planning Commission Resolution
- Exhibit B: Board of Supervisors File No. 210699

This page intentionally blank.



PLANNING COMMISSION DRAFT RESOLUTION

HEARING DATE: September 9, 2021

Project Name: Accessory Dwelling Units
Case Number: 2021-006353PCA [Board File No. 210699]
Initiated by: Supervisors Mandelman, Ronen, and Preston / Introduced June 15, 2021
Staff Contact: Veronica Flores, Legislative Affairs
veronica.flores@sfgov.org, (628) 652-7525
Reviewed by: Aaron D Starr, Manager of Legislative Affairs
aaron.starr@sfgov.org, (628) 652-7533

RESOLUTION APPROVING WITH MODIFICATION A PROPOSED ORDINANCE THAT WOULD AMEND THE PLANNING CODE TO CLARIFY THE REQUIREMENTS FOR APPLICATIONS TO CONSTRUCT ACCESSORY DWELLING UNITS UNDER THE CITY’S LOCAL ACCESSORY DWELLING UNIT APPROVAL PROCESS; AMENDING THE ADMINISTRATIVE CODE TO CLARIFY THAT LANDLORDS MAY NOT REMOVE TENANT HOUSING SERVICES WITHOUT JUST CAUSE AND THAT ISSUANCE OF A BUILDING PERMIT DOES NOT CONSTITUTE JUST CAUSE; MAKING FINDINGS AS REQUIRED BY THE TENANT PROTECTION ACT OF 2019; AFFIRMING THE PLANNING DEPARTMENT’S DETERMINATION UNDER THE CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT; AND MAKING FINDINGS OF CONSISTENCY WITH THE GENERAL PLAN, AND THE EIGHT PRIORITY POLICIES OF PLANNING CODE, SECTION 101.1.

WHEREAS, on June 15, 2021 Supervisors, Mandelman, Ronen, and Preston introduced a proposed Ordinance under Board of Supervisors (hereinafter “Board”) File Number 210699, which would amend the Planning Code to clarify the requirements for applications to construct Accessory Dwelling Units under the City’s local Accessory Dwelling Unit approval process; amending the Administrative Code to clarify that landlords may not remove tenant housing services without just cause and that issuance of a building permit does not constitute just cause; making findings as required by the Tenant Protection Act of 2019;

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission (hereinafter “Commission”) conducted a duly noticed public hearing at a regularly scheduled meeting to consider the proposed Ordinance on September 9, 2021; and,

WHEREAS, the proposed Ordinance has been determined to be categorically exempt from environmental review under the California Environmental Quality Act Section 15060(c)(2) and 15378; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission has heard and considered the testimony presented to it at the public hearing and has further considered written materials and oral testimony presented on behalf of Department staff and other interested parties; and

WHEREAS, all pertinent documents may be found in the files of the Department, as the custodian of records, at 49 South Van Ness Avenue, Suite 1400, San Francisco; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission has reviewed the proposed Ordinance; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission finds from the facts presented that the public necessity, convenience, and general welfare require the proposed amendment; and

MOVED, that the Planning Commission hereby **approves with modifications** the proposed ordinance. The Commission's proposed recommendations are as follows:

1. For ADUs under the Local Program where no housing services are removed and there are no tenant appeals, allow the applicant to submit proof of notification materials directly to Planning, without submitting a declaration to the Rent Board.
2. Allow the Planning Department to approve ADUs proposed under the Local ADU Program if the housing service proposed for removal is a parking space.

Findings

Having reviewed the materials identified in the preamble above, and having heard all testimony and arguments, this Commission finds, concludes, and determines as follows:

1. The Commission finds that the proposed Ordinance supports the Housing Element's goals to ensure adequate housing for current and future San Franciscans by increasing the potential for new Accessory Dwelling Units.
2. The Commission finds that the proposed will further protect existing tenants' rights.

General Plan Compliance

The proposed Ordinance and the Commission's recommended modifications are consistent with the following Objectives and Policies of the General Plan:

HOUSING ELEMENT

OBJECTIVE 1

IDENTIFY AND MAKE AVAILABLE FOR DEVELOPMENT ADEQUATE SITES TO MEET THE CITY'S HOUSING NEEDS, ESPECIALLY PERMANENTLY AFFORDABLE HOUSING.

Policy 1.5

Consider secondary units in community plans where there is neighborhood support and when other neighborhood goals can be achieved, especially if that housing is made permanently affordable to lower-income households.

OBJECTIVE 3

PROTECT THE AFFORDABILITY OF THE EXISTING HOUSING STOCK, ESPECIALLY RENTAL UNITS.

Policy 3.4

Preserve “naturally affordable” housing types, such as smaller and older ownership units.

The General Plan identifies ADUs as an effective and inexpensive way to increase the housing supply. The Ordinance retains existing housing units and prioritizes permanently affordable housing. Additionally, the proposed amendments would expand protections for existing tenants.

Planning Code Section 101 Findings

The proposed amendments to the Planning Code are consistent with the eight Priority Policies set forth in Section 101.1(b) of the Planning Code in that:

1. That existing neighborhood-serving retail uses be preserved and enhanced and future opportunities for resident employment in and ownership of such businesses enhanced;

The proposed Ordinance would not have a negative effect on neighborhood serving retail uses and will not have a negative effect on opportunities for resident employment in and ownership of neighborhood-serving retail.

2. That existing housing and neighborhood character be conserved and protected in order to preserve the cultural and economic diversity of our neighborhoods;

The proposed Ordinance would not have a negative effect on housing or neighborhood character.

3. That the City's supply of affordable housing be preserved and enhanced;

The proposed Ordinance would not have an adverse effect on the City's supply of affordable housing.

4. That commuter traffic not impede MUNI transit service or overburden our streets or neighborhood parking;

The proposed Ordinance would not result in commuter traffic impeding MUNI transit service or

overburdening the streets or neighborhood parking.

5. That a diverse economic base be maintained by protecting our industrial and service sectors from displacement due to commercial office development, and that future opportunities for resident employment and ownership in these sectors be enhanced;

The proposed Ordinance would not cause displacement of the industrial or service sectors due to office development, and future opportunities for resident employment or ownership in these sectors would not be impaired.

6. That the City achieve the greatest possible preparedness to protect against injury and loss of life in an earthquake;

The proposed Ordinance would not have an adverse effect on City's preparedness against injury and loss of life in an earthquake.

7. That the landmarks and historic buildings be preserved;

The proposed Ordinance would not have an adverse effect on the City's Landmarks and historic buildings.

8. That our parks and open space and their access to sunlight and vistas be protected from development;

The proposed Ordinance would not have an adverse effect on the City's parks and open space and their access to sunlight and vistas.

Planning Code Section 302 Findings.

The Planning Commission finds from the facts presented that the public necessity, convenience and general welfare require the proposed amendments to the Planning Code as set forth in Section 302.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Commission hereby APPROVES WITH MODIFICATIONS the proposed Ordinance as described in this Resolution.

I hereby certify that the foregoing Resolution was adopted by the Commission at its meeting on September 9, 2021.

Jonas P. Ionin
Commission Secretary

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

ADOPTED: September 9, 2021

This page intentionally blank.

1 [Planning, Administrative Codes - Accessory Dwelling Units]

2

3 **Ordinance amending the Planning Code to clarify the requirements for applications to**
 4 **construct Accessory Dwelling Units under the City's local Accessory Dwelling Unit**
 5 **approval process; amending the Administrative Code to clarify that landlords may not**
 6 **remove tenant housing services without just cause and that issuance of a building**
 7 **permit does not constitute just cause; making findings as required by the Tenant**
 8 **Protection Act of 2019; affirming the Planning Department's determination under the**
 9 **California Environmental Quality Act; and making findings of consistency with the**
 10 **General Plan, and the eight priority policies of Planning Code, Section 101.1.**

11 NOTE: **Unchanged Code text and uncodified text** are in plain Arial font.
 12 **Additions to Codes** are in *single-underline italics Times New Roman font*.
 13 **Deletions to Codes** are in *strikethrough italics Times New Roman font*.
 14 **Board amendment additions** are in double-underlined Arial font.
 15 **Board amendment deletions** are in ~~strikethrough Arial font~~.
 16 **Asterisks (* * * *)** indicate the omission of unchanged Code
 17 subsections or parts of tables.

15

16 Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

17

18 Section 1. Findings.

19 (a) The Planning Department has determined that the actions contemplated in this
 20 ordinance comply with the California Environmental Quality Act (California Public Resources
 21 Code Sections 21000 et seq.). Said determination is on file with the Clerk of the Board of
 22 Supervisors in File No. ____ and is incorporated herein by reference. The Board affirms this
 23 determination.

24 (b) On _____, the Planning Commission, in Resolution No. _____,
 25 adopted findings that the actions contemplated in this ordinance are consistent, on balance,

1 with the City's General Plan and eight priority policies of Planning Code Section 101.1. The
2 Board adopts these findings as its own. A copy of said Resolution is on file with the Clerk of
3 the Board of Supervisors in File No. _____, and is incorporated herein by reference.

4 (c) This ordinance is intended in part to clarify the existing rules in the Rent Ordinance
5 as to housing services. The term housing services refers to services provided by the landlord
6 connected with the use or occupancy of a rental unit including, but not limited to, access to
7 areas such as garages, driveways, storage spaces, laundry rooms, decks, patios, gardens on
8 the same lot, and kitchen facilities or lobbies in single room occupancy (SRO) hotels. This
9 ordinance clarifies that landlords may not sever, remove, or reduce housing services without
10 just cause, and that this rule applies equally to landlords who intend to construct Accessory
11 Dwelling Units. These landlords must comply with just cause rules, and being in possession
12 of a building permit does not, in and of itself, confer just cause to sever a housing service. By
13 clarifying that the just cause rules in the Rent Ordinance apply, this ordinance is more
14 protective than the Tenant Protection Act of 2019 (Cal. Civ. Code § 1946.2), as the Rent
15 Ordinance further limits the reasons for termination of a residential tenancy, provides for
16 higher relocation assistance amounts, and provides additional tenant protections.

17
18 Section 2. Article 2 of the Planning Code is hereby amended by revising Section 207,
19 to read as follows:

20 **SEC. 207. DWELLING UNIT DENSITY LIMITS.**

21 * * * *

22 (c) **Exceptions to Dwelling Unit Density Limits.** An exception to the calculations
23 under this Section 207 shall be made in the following circumstances:

24 * * * *

1 (4) Local Accessory Dwelling Unit Program: Accessory Dwelling Units
2 in Multifamily Buildings; Accessory Dwelling Units in Single-Family Homes That Do Not
3 Strictly Meet the Requirements in subsection (c)(6).

4 * * * *

5 (C) Controls on Construction. An Accessory Dwelling Unit regulated
6 by this subsection (c)(4) is permitted to be constructed in an existing or proposed building
7 under the following conditions:

8 (i) For lots that have four existing Dwelling Units or fewer or
9 where the zoning would permit the construction of four or fewer Dwelling Units, one ADU is
10 permitted; for lots that have more than four existing Dwelling Units or are undergoing seismic
11 retrofitting under subsection (c)(4)(F) below, or where the zoning would permit the
12 construction of more than four Dwelling Units, there is no limit on the number of ADUs
13 permitted, ~~provided, however, that~~

14 (ii) ~~The~~ Department shall not approve an application for
15 construction of an ADU where a tenant on the lot has been evicted pursuant to Administrative
16 Code Sections 37.9(a)(9) through (a)(12) and 37.9(a)(14) under a notice of eviction served
17 within 10 years prior to filing the application for a building permit to construct the ADU or
18 where a tenant has been evicted pursuant to Administrative Code Section 37.9(a)(8) under a
19 notice of eviction served within five years prior to filing the application for a building permit to
20 construct the ADU. This ~~provision~~ subsection (c)(4)(C)(ii) shall not apply if the tenant was evicted
21 under Section 37.9(a)(11) or 37.9(a)(14) and the applicant(s) either (A) have certified that the
22 original tenant reoccupied the unit after the temporary eviction or (B) have submitted to the
23 Department and to the Residential Rent Stabilization and Arbitration Board (Rent Board) a
24 declaration from the property owner or the tenant certifying that the property owner notified
25 the tenant of the tenant’s right to reoccupy the unit and the tenant chose not to reoccupy it.

1 more than 10 feet above grade; and lightwell infills provided that the infill will be against a
2 blank neighboring wall at the property line and not visible from any off-site location; as these
3 spaces existed as of July 11, 2016. An ADU constructed entirely within the existing built
4 envelope, as defined in this subsection~~(ii)~~, along with permitted obstructions allowed in
5 Section 136(c)(32), of an existing building or authorized auxiliary structure on the same lot, or
6 where an existing stand-alone garage or storage structure has been expanded to add
7 dormers, is exempt from the notification requirements of Section 311 of this Code unless the
8 existing building or authorized auxiliary structure on the same lot is in an Article 10 or Article
9 11 District, in which case the notification requirements will apply. If an ADU will be constructed
10 under a cantilevered room or deck that encroaches into the required rear yard, a pre-
11 application meeting between the applicant and adjacent neighbors for all the proposed work is
12 required before the application may be submitted.

13 (iii) When a stand-alone garage, storage, or other auxiliary
14 structure is being converted to an ADU, an expansion to the envelope is allowed to add
15 dormers even if the stand-alone garage, storage structure, or other auxiliary structure is in the
16 required rear yard.

17 (iv) On a corner lot, a legal stand-alone nonconforming garage,
18 storage structure, or other auxiliary structure may be expanded within its existing footprint by
19 up to one additional story in order to create a consistent street wall and improve the continuity
20 of buildings on the block.

21 (v) An Accessory Dwelling Unit shall not be constructed using
22 space from an existing Dwelling Unit except that an ADU may expand into habitable space on
23 the ground or basement floors provided that it does not exceed 25% of the gross square
24 footage of such space. The Zoning Administrator may waive this 25% limitation if ~~(a)~~ the
25 resulting space would not be usable or would be impractical to use for other reasonable uses

1 included but not limited to storage or bicycle parking or (b2) waiving the limitation would help
2 relieve any negative layout issues for the proposed ADU.

3 (viii) An existing building undergoing seismic retrofitting may be
4 eligible for a height increase pursuant to subsection (c)(4)(F) below.

5 (vix) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Code, an
6 Accessory Dwelling Unit authorized under this ~~Section 207~~subsection (c)(4) may not be merged
7 with an original unit(s).

8 (vix) An Accessory Dwelling Unit shall not be permitted in any
9 building in a Neighborhood Commercial District or in the Chinatown Community Business or
10 Visitor Retail Districts if it would eliminate or reduce a ground-story retail or commercial space,
11 unless the Accessory Dwelling Unit is a Designated Child Care Unit, as defined in Section
12 102, and meets all applicable standards of Planning Code Section 414A.6(e).

13 * * * *

14 (J) **Notification.** Prior to submitting an application to construct an
15 ADU under this subsection (c)(4), the property owner shall cause a notice describing the proposed
16 project to be posted on the subject property for at least 15 days, cause a written notice describing the
17 proposed project to be mailed or delivered to each unit (including unauthorized units) at the subject
18 property at least 15 days prior to submitting an application to construct an ADU, and submit proof of
19 these notices to the Planning Department as part of the application to construct an ADU. These
20 notices shall have a format and content determined by the Zoning Administrator, and shall generally
21 describe the project, including the number and location of the proposed ADU(s), and how to obtain the
22 written declaration required by subsection (c)(4)(C)(iii). These notices shall describe how to obtain
23 additional information regarding the project and shall provide contact information for the Planning
24 Department that complies with the requirements of the Language Access Ordinance, Chapter 91 of the
25 Administrative Code, to provide vital information about the Planning Department’s services or

1 programs in the languages spoken by a Substantial Number of Limited English Speaking Persons, as
2 defined in Chapter 91.

3 * * * *

4
5 Section 3. Chapter 37 of the Administrative Code is hereby amended by revising
6 Sections 37.2 and 37.9, to read as follows:

7 **SEC. 37.2. DEFINITIONS.**

8 * * * *

9 (r) Rental Units. All residential dwelling units in the City and County of San Francisco
10 together with the land and appurtenant buildings thereto, and all housing services, privileges,
11 furnishings, and facilities supplied in connection with the use or occupancy thereof, including
12 garage and parking facilities.

13 Garage facilities, parking facilities, driveways, storage spaces, laundry rooms, decks,
14 patios, or gardens on the same lot, or kitchen facilities or lobbies in single room occupancy
15 (SRO) hotels, supplied in connection with the use or occupancy of a unit, may not be severed
16 from the tenancy by the landlord without just cause as required by Section 37.9(a). Any
17 severance, reduction or removal of a housing service, even if permitted under ~~this Section 37.2(r)~~
18 Section 37.9(a), shall be offset by a corresponding reduction in rent. Either a landlord or a
19 tenant may file a petition with the Rent Board to determine the amount of the rent reduction.
20 For the avoidance of doubt, the issuance of a permit for construction of an Accessory Dwelling Unit
21 does not in and of itself constitute a just cause for the purpose of severing a housing service.

22 * * * *

23 **SEC. 37.9. EVICTIONS.**

24 Notwithstanding Section 37.3, this Section 37.9 shall apply as of August 24, 1980, to
25 all landlords and tenants of rental units as defined in Section 37.2(r).

1 * * * *

2 (f) Whenever a landlord wrongfully endeavors to recover possession or recovers
3 possession of a rental unit in violation of Sections 37.9 and/or 37.10A as enacted herein, or
4 wrongfully endeavors to sever or severs a housing service supplied in connection with the use or
5 occupancy of a rental unit as set forth in Section 37.2(r), the tenant or Rent Board may institute a
6 civil proceeding for injunctive relief, money damages of not less than three times actual
7 damages (including damages for mental or emotional distress as specified below), and
8 whatever other relief the court deems appropriate. If the landlord has recovered possession
9 pursuant to Section 37.9(a)(8), such action shall be brought no later than five years after (1)
10 the date the landlord files the first statement of occupancy with the Rent Board under Section
11 37.9(a)(8)(vii) or (2) three months after the landlord recovers possession, whichever is earlier.
12 In the case of an award of damages for mental or emotional distress, said award shall only be
13 trebled if the trier of fact finds that the landlord acted in knowing violation of or in reckless
14 disregard of Section 37.9 or 37.10A herein. The prevailing party shall be entitled to
15 reasonable attorney's fees and costs pursuant to order of the court. The remedy available
16 under this Section 37.9(f) shall be in addition to any other existing remedies which may be
17 available to the tenant or the Rent Board.

18 * * * *

19
20 Section 4. Effective Date. This ordinance shall become effective 30 days after
21 enactment. Enactment occurs when the Mayor signs the ordinance, the Mayor returns the
22 ordinance unsigned or does not sign the ordinance within ten days of receiving it, or the Board
23 of Supervisors overrides the Mayor's veto of the ordinance.
24
25

1 Section 5. Scope of Ordinance. In enacting this ordinance, the Board of Supervisors
2 intends to amend only those words, phrases, paragraphs, subsections, sections, articles,
3 numbers, punctuation marks, charts, diagrams, or any other constituent parts of the Municipal
4 Code that are explicitly shown in this ordinance as additions, deletions, Board amendment
5 additions, and Board amendment deletions in accordance with the “Note” that appears under
6 the official title of the ordinance.

7

8 APPROVED AS TO FORM:
9 DENNIS J. HERRERA, City Attorney

10 By: /s/ Peter R. Miljanich
11 PETER R. MILJANICH
12 Deputy City Attorney

13 n:\legana\as2021\2100393\01537874.docx

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

BOARD of SUPERVISORS



City Hall
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco 94102-4689
Tel. No. (415) 554-5184
Fax No. (415) 554-5163
TDD/TTY No. (415) 554-5227

June 22, 2021

File No. 210699

Lisa Gibson
Environmental Review Officer
Planning Department
49 South Van Ness Avenue, Suite 1400
San Francisco, CA 94103

Dear Ms. Gibson:

On June 15, 2021, Supervisor Mandelman submitted the following legislation:

File No. 210699

Ordinance amending the Planning Code to clarify the requirements for applications to construct Accessory Dwelling Units under the City's local Accessory Dwelling Unit approval process; amending the Administrative Code to clarify that landlords may not remove tenant housing services without just cause and that issuance of a building permit does not constitute just cause; making findings as required by the Tenant Protection Act of 2019; affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act; and making findings of consistency with the General Plan, and the eight priority policies of Planning Code, Section 101.1.

This legislation is being transmitted to you for environmental review.

Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Erica Major".

By: Erica Major, Assistant Clerk
Land Use and Transportation Committee

Attachment

c: Joy Navarrete, Environmental Planning
Don Lewis, Environmental Planning

Not defined as a project under CEQA Guidelines
Sections 15378 and 15060(c)(2) because it would not result in
a direct or indirect physical change in the environment.

July 22, 2021

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Joy Navarrete".

From: [Flores, Veronica \(CPC\)](#)
To: [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: RE: PC Response for Substitute - (File No 210699) Planning, Administrative Codes - Accessory Dwelling Units
Date: Thursday, October 14, 2021 2:08:21 PM

Hi Erica,

Planning Commission already considered these amendments at the September 9th hearing so the transmittal on file covers the re-referral.

Thanks,

Veronica Flores
628.652.7525

From: Major, Erica (BOS) <erica.major@sfgov.org>
Sent: Thursday, October 14, 2021 2:04 PM
To: Flores, Veronica (CPC) <Veronica.Flores@sfgov.org>
Subject: PC Response for Substitute - (File No 210699) Planning, Administrative Codes - Accessory Dwelling Units

Hello Veronica,

This item was substituted last week and I re-referred this out to Planning. Is the Commission going to re-hear this matter?

ERICA MAJOR

Assistant Clerk

Board of Supervisors

1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, City Hall, Room 244 San Francisco, CA 94102

Phone: (415) 554-4441 | Fax: (415) 554-5163

Erica.Major@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

(VIRTUAL APPOINTMENTS) To schedule a “virtual” meeting with me (on Microsoft Teams), please ask and I can answer your questions in real time.

Due to the current COVID-19 health emergency and the Shelter in Place Order, the Office of the Clerk of the Board is working remotely while providing complete access to the legislative process and our services.

Click [HERE](#) to complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Service Satisfaction form.

The [Legislative Research Center](#) provides 24-hour access to Board of Supervisors legislation, and archived matters since August 1998.

~~~~~

**Disclosures:** Personal information that is provided in communications to the Board of Supervisors is subject to disclosure under the California Public Records Act and the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance. Personal information

*provided will not be redacted. Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Board of Supervisors and its committees. All written or oral communications that members of the public submit to the Clerk's Office regarding pending legislation or hearings will be made available to all members of the public for inspection and copying. The Clerk's Office does not redact any information from these submissions. This means that personal information—including names, phone numbers, addresses and similar information that a member of the public elects to submit to the Board and its committees—may appear on the Board of Supervisors website or in other public documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.*

**From:** [Henrietta Weiner](#)  
**To:** [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** re: Monday, Oct.18 - Supervisor Mandelman"s ordinance to protect tenants from harm by (ADU) construction  
**Date:** Saturday, October 16, 2021 12:52:44 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

As a SF resident and renter since the 1980's, I am a strong supporter of Supervisor Rafael Mandelman's Ordinance protecting tenants from harm by ADU construction.

Being able to access and keep regular apartment amenities, and services such as laundry facilities and parking greatly impact our "sense of being at home" in our own rented units. It provides a sense of security, safety, well-being and convenience. These become even more necessary and vital as we get older. (I am a 62 year old woman).

ADU Construction will provide so much disruption in many different facets of living in a building. It will create severe noise pollution, exposure to dust, chemicals, lack of privacy due to access of outsiders (construction, suppliers, etc.) into the building, along with potential risk for safety from accidents that happen. (These we have experienced in more than 10-months of renovation during the height of the pandemic in 2020 by B+T at 700 Church.)

ADUs specifically like the one proposed by B+T to 700 Church is clearly all about profit and earning potential for its investors. It has no consideration for its Tenants who provide them their income in the first place. It is one-sided period.

Thank you very much,

Henrietta Weiner  
700 Church, #101  
SF, CA 94114

**From:** [Kathy Lipscomb](#)  
**To:** [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Planning, Administrative Codes - Accessory Dwelling Units  
**Date:** Monday, October 18, 2021 10:04:59 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

To whom it may concern:

My name is Kathy Lipscomb and I am a member of the Tenants Union as well as Senior & Disability Action.

I urge you to amend the Administrative Code to clarify that landlords cannot remove certain housing services without just cause and **that issuance of a building permit does not constitute** just cause.

Moreover, it is essential that findings required under the Tenants Protection Act of 2019; findings under CEQA, the General Plan and Priority policies of Planning Code Section 101.1 be followed.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

**From:** [Aaron P. Leifer](#)  
**To:** [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Public Comment on Mandelman ADU Legislation  
**Date:** Monday, October 18, 2021 11:28:31 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

I am writing to express my support of Rafael Mandelman's ADU legislation. The legislation proposed will support the construction of lawful ADUs while protecting vulnerable tenants' rights.

Too many times we've seen large, corporate landlords exploit the loophole in city administrative policy to construct ADUs that violate tenants' rights by removing housing services like laundry, parking, and storage that are essential to their tenancy and maintaining a quality of life, often as long-term tenants. Such landlords often sought permits and removed housing services without even providing notice to tenants so that they can respond.

This no-brainer legislation takes the necessary step of closing those loopholes. This will benefit some of San Francisco's most vulnerable renters, especially seniors and people with disabilities.

In addition, it will not prohibit the construction of ADUs that would've been already lawful so San Francisco can continue to address its housing crisis. I strongly encourage the Land Use Committee to swiftly approve this no-brainer legislation to help protect tenants and enforce the laws that are already on the books.

Thank you for your consideration.

Aaron P. Leifer  
District 8 Resident and Renter  
e: [aaronpleifer@gmail.com](mailto:aaronpleifer@gmail.com) | p: he/him

**From:** [555BV Tenants](#)  
**To:** [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Public Comment Re: File #210699 - Oct 18, 2021 Meeting of Land Use and Transportation Committee  
**Date:** Monday, October 18, 2021 11:48:02 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Land Use and Transportation Committee,

We represent a significant number of very long-term tenants (10 to 40+ year tenancies), a large proportion of whom are seniors. We live in a 41-unit (Rent Ordinance-covered, 1929-built) building at 555 Buena Vista Ave West, San Francisco. (Planning District 6; Supervisor District 8)

**We are writing in strong support for the Ordinance (File #210699) sponsored by Supervisors Mandelman, Ronen, Preston and Melgar that aims to clarify the existing rights of tenants to their contracted housing services.**

**We encourage the Committee to support this Ordinance. It is fair, reasonable, and clarifies the existing rights of tenants without jeopardizing the City's housing goals.**

**Building Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs) that would sever or substantially reduce contracted housing services *done at the expense of existing tenants* in the building is unfair.**

Our building is located in a very hilly area in which street parking is often limited and difficult to find and commercial laundry services are many blocks and hills away. Among the building's highly valued housing services are garage parking (16 of 22 spaces currently contracted, many by seniors and tenants with mobility issues) and in-house common laundry facility, bicycle parking, and accessible trash facilities. *Access to these housing services is an essential part of the reason we chose to move into this building and why we remain living in our building and in San Francisco.*

Ballast Investments has applied for a building permit to build 4 ADUs in our garage areas and to expand an existing unit into the garage area. This construction would result in the permanent removal of *at least* 13 of the 22 garage parking spaces (thus, severing the parking services of a significant number of tenants with contracted parking) and the reduction in the quality and quantity of laundry, trash, and bicycle parking services.

**Continued access to existing garage parking and other existing housing services is important for all current tenants in our building. This access is especially critical to building seniors and tenants with mobility issues, enabling us to lead healthy, safe, and independent lives, to remain in our homes, and to continue to contribute to and be part of our larger communities. Without these services, many of us would need to move in order to seek these housing services in a building elsewhere and we fear that we would no longer be able to live in San Francisco.**

This legislation is not about stopping the construction of ADUs; it is about protecting established rights of tenants.

Thank you for taking the time to consider the impact this legislation would have on our lives. We encourage the Committee to support this Ordinance.

Tenants, 555 Buena Vista Ave West  
Members, Ballast Tenants Association

**From:** [Christopher Pederson](#)  
**To:** [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#)  
**Cc:** [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Re: Proposed ADU ordinance - Land Use & Transportation Comm. Agenda item no. 3 (file no. 210699)  
**Date:** Friday, October 15, 2021 2:15:11 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisor Mandelman:

I gather that the intent of this legislation is to address situations where it appears that landlords have tried to create ADUs in ways that abuse current tenants, maybe with the goal of driving out longstanding tenants with relatively low rents. If that is the case, then the ordinance should be tailored to address those situations. Effectively prohibiting the conversion of parking spaces to ADUs via the ADU "Local Program" is a very blunt, unnecessarily broad way of doing that. I hope you and the rest of the Board can come up with an approach that doesn't undermine what I thought were the city's housing, climate, and transportation goals.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Christopher Pederson

> On Oct 15, 2021, at 11:05 AM, Christopher Pederson <chpederson@yahoo.com> wrote:

>

> Dear Chair Melgar, Vice Chair Preston, and Supervisor Peskin:

>

> The proposed ADU ordinance poses at least two vital questions about where San Francisco's priorities lie: 1) Does San Francisco place higher value on creating new rent-controlled apartments to address the city's housing crisis than perpetuating private parking spaces? 2) Does San Francisco place higher value on addressing the climate crisis by creating more housing close to transit and employment centers or does it instead place higher value on private parking spaces that facilitate more driving?

>

> If one believes our city leaders' frequent pronouncements about the need to provide more rent-controlled housing, about the urgent need to address the climate emergency, and about the need to get serious about the city's often invoked but infrequently and feebly implemented Transit First policies, then the answers to these questions should be obvious. I fear, however, that the Board of Supervisors will instead place a higher value on perpetuating storage space for automobiles than housing for human beings and the health of our climate.

>

> Please prove my fears wrong. Please amend the proposed ordinance so that the replacement of parking spaces with rent-controlled ADUs qualifies as "just cause" for severing a housing service so long as current tenants with a right to use those spaces receive appropriate reductions in rent.

>

> Thank you for your consideration of my comments.

>

> Sincerely,

>

> Christopher Pederson

> District 7 resident

**From:** [Christopher Pederson](#)  
**To:** [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#)  
**Cc:** [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#)  
**Subject:** Proposed ADU ordinance - Land Use & Transportation Comm. Agenda Item no. 3 (file no. 210699)  
**Date:** Friday, October 15, 2021 11:14:08 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Chair Melgar, Vice Chair Preston, and Supervisor Peskin:

The proposed ADU ordinance poses at least two vital questions about where San Francisco's priorities lie: 1) Does San Francisco place higher value on creating new rent-controlled apartments to address the city's housing crisis than perpetuating private parking spaces? 2) Does San Francisco place higher value on addressing the climate crisis by creating more housing close to transit and employment centers or does it instead place higher value on private parking spaces that facilitate more driving?

If one believes our city leaders' frequent pronouncements about the need to provide more rent-controlled housing, about the urgent need to address the climate emergency, and about the need to get serious about the city's often invoked but infrequently and feebly implemented Transit First policies, then the answers to these questions should be obvious. I fear, however, that the Board of Supervisors will instead place a higher value on perpetuating storage space for automobiles than housing for human beings and the health of our climate.

Please prove my fears wrong. Please amend the proposed ordinance so that the replacement of parking spaces with rent-controlled ADUs qualifies as "just cause" for severing a housing service so long as current tenants with a right to use those spaces receive appropriate reductions in rent.

Thank you for your consideration of my comments.

Sincerely,

Christopher Pederson  
District 7 resident

**From:** [Amy Yvonne Yu](#)  
**To:** [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Housing services ordinance at Land Use committee Monday 10.18.2021  
**Date:** Friday, October 15, 2021 10:31:39 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Land Use committee,

My name is Amy Yu, a tenant at 530 Stockton Street. I am writing to express my strong support for Supervisor Mandelman's proposed ordinance clarifying the existing rights of tenants to their contracted housing services.

This legislation is not about stopping ADUs—it's about protecting the already established rights of tenants such as myself. At 530 Stockton Street, our landlord Brick+Timber (Ballast Investments) unlawfully removed our housing services this March as an attempt to vacate more long term tenants. Without proper notification of 15 days, they unlawfully removed our basement services in less than 3 days: laundry, backyard access, secure bike storage, parking spaces, and basement exit (which was also our secondary egress) under the guise of an ADU renovation. This caused much distress for all tenants who relied on these services, especially during a pandemic. Our 6 story building is on a 45 degree incline with a constantly broken elevator, just not having laundry alone was a huge point of contention for many tenants in the building. Tenants stored their bikes in the secure storage to prevent damage from the elements and theft. Many also used our backyard daily to get some much needed fresh air in between our work from home days from our tiny 400 square feet studios in addition to walking and relieving their dogs. Additionally, there was at least 1 parking spot that was leased at the time the basement services were removed. Just from this incident alone, 2 more long term tenants moved out of the building shortly. Had this legislation been put into effect, then our housing services should have never been severed at all and the long term tenants would not have felt like they had to move due to the lack of housing services.

I highly encourage the Commission to recommend this ordinance to the Board of Supervisors. It is fair, reasonable, and clarifies the existing rights of tenants without jeopardizing the City's housing goals.

Thank you very much for your consideration,  
Amy Yu  
Member, Ballast Tenants Association

**From:** [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Why SF's ADU is More Toxic than Facebook  
**Date:** Thursday, October 14, 2021 2:49:55 PM

---

210699

**Alisa Somera**

Legislative Deputy Director  
San Francisco Board of Supervisors  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244  
San Francisco, CA 94102  
415.554.7711 direct | 415.554.5163 fax  
[alisa.somera@sfgov.org](mailto:alisa.somera@sfgov.org)

**(VIRTUAL APPOINTMENTS)** To schedule a "virtual" meeting with me (on Microsoft Teams), please ask and I can answer your questions in real time.

*Due to the current COVID-19 health emergency and the Shelter in Place Order, the Office of the Clerk of the Board is working remotely while providing complete access to the legislative process and our services.*

Click [HERE](#) to complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Service Satisfaction form.

The [Legislative Research Center](#) provides 24-hour access to Board of Supervisors legislation, and archived matters since August 1998.

~~~~~

Disclosures: Personal information that is provided in communications to the Board of Supervisors is subject to disclosure under the California Public Records Act and the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance. Personal information provided will not be redacted. Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Board of Supervisors and its committees. All written or oral communications that members of the public submit to the Clerk's Office regarding pending legislation or hearings will be made available to all members of the public for inspection and copying. The Clerk's Office does not redact any information from these submissions. This means that personal information—including names, phone numbers, addresses and similar information that a member of the public elects to submit to the Board and its committees—may appear on the Board of Supervisors website or in other public documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.

From: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Sent: Thursday, October 14, 2021 12:53 PM
To: BOS-Supervisors <bos-supervisors@sfgov.org>
Cc: Calvillo, Angela (BOS) <angela.calvillo@sfgov.org>; Laxamana, Junko (BOS) <junko.laxamana@sfgov.org>; Mchugh, Eileen (BOS) <eileen.e.mchugh@sfgov.org>; Ng, Wilson (BOS) <wilson.l.ng@sfgov.org>; Somera, Alisa (BOS) <alisa.somera@sfgov.org>
Subject: FW: Why SF's ADU is More Toxic than Facebook

From: ROGER DAWSON - CPOST <roger@cpost.com>
Sent: Wednesday, October 6, 2021 4:38 PM
To: Bintliff, Jacob (BOS) <jacob.bintliff@sfgov.org>; MandelmanStaff, [BOS] <mandelmanstaff@sfgov.org>; Mandelman, Rafael (BOS) <rafael.mandelman@sfgov.org>; Phung, Kristina (CPC) <kristina.phung@sfgov.org>; Chandler, Mathew (CPC) <mathew.chandler@sfgov.org>; Winslow, David (CPC) <david.winslow@sfgov.org>; Koppel, Joel (CPC) <joel.koppel@sfgov.org>; Moore, Kathrin (CPC) <kathrin.moore@sfgov.org>; Tanner, Rachael (CPC) <rachael.tanner@sfgov.org>; Cook, Lorabelle (CPC) <lorabelle.cook@sfgov.org>; Peskin, Aaron (BOS) <aaron.peskin@sfgov.org>; Fewer, Sandra (BOS) <sandra.fewer@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; Chan, Deland (CPC) <deland.chan@sfgov.org>; Diamond, Susan (CPC) <sue.diamond@sfgov.org>; Navarrete, Joy (CPC) <joy.navarrete@sfgov.org>; Haney, Matt (BOS) <matt.haney@sfgov.org>; Jalipa, Brent (BOS) <brent.jalipa@sfgov.org>; lisa.liew@sfgov.org; Wong, Jocelyn (BOS) <jocelyn.wong@sfgov.org>; Wong, Linda (BOS) <linda.wong@sfgov.org>; Fung, Frank (CPC) <frank.fung@sfgov.org>; Imperial, Theresa (CPC) <theresa.imperial@sfgov.org>; Lewis, Don (CPC) <don.lewis@sfgov.org>; Baeza, Rogelio (CPC) <rogelio.baeza@sfgov.org>; brad Hirn <brad@hrcsf.org>; Mar, Gordon (BOS) <gordon.mar@sfgov.org>; Ronen, Hillary <hillary.ronen@sfgov.org>; Safai, Ahsha (BOS) <ahsha.safai@sfgov.org>; Stefani, Catherine (BOS) <catherine.stefani@sfgov.org>; Walton, Shamann (BOS) <shamann.walton@sfgov.org>; Yee, Norman (BOS) <norman.yee@sfgov.org>; Breed, Mayor London (MYR) <mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org>; Preston, Dean (BOS) <dean.preston@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; anastasia Yovanopoulos <shashacooks@yahoo.com>; Kwiatkowska, Natalia (CPC) <natalia.kwiatkowska@sfgov.org>; Flores, Veronica (CPC) <Veronica.Flores@sfgov.org>
Subject: Why SF's ADU is More Toxic than Facebook


This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Planning Commission, Planners and Supervisors,

Watching recent events unfold exposing the harm an unregulated Facebook is inflicting on society, an observable analogy comes to mind: that the ADU with its lack of controls has spawned comparable damage here in Our City. In the same way that Facebook's algorithms draw in extremists and instigate toxic behavior, the ADU has drawn in greedy developers from across the country that are abusing tenants in their pursuit of "profits at any cost".

Bullying, harassment and the infliction of emotional distress are not just the realm of Facebook, but are being instigated and amplified by the ADU.

Supervisor Mandelman's ACCESSORY DWELLING UNIT CONTROLS need to be adopted immediately to stop the madness and the harm being inflicted upon SF residents. The ADU was flawed legislation hastily adopted at a manic time in SF's boom/bust housing market. It threw common sense out the window when it came to ADU projects. This isn't surprising considering wealthy developers were covertly behind its origination and were exploiting the legislation before the ink was even dry.



It is time for a change and as we have seen this week, change often happens only after an outrageous, over-the-top event finally triggers reform.

The **801 Corbett ADU** is that event:



A proposed ADU so outrageous in scope and harm that common sense should have warranted its rejection at the time it was filed. An ADU so overreaching that it has instigated reform of the existing ADU legislation. Long before it was even filed, Roger Dawson of 801 Corbett having uncovered what the new owner/developer was up to (despite their deliberately trying to keep it a secret), spoke before the Planning Commission in early 2019 and warned about rapidly escalating abuse of the ADU:



The very idea of turning one of San Francisco's architecturally unique and superbly well balanced mid-century apartment buildings into a dysfunctional and horrendously overcrowded tenement is so absurd that no one should have ever given it serious consideration. The mere fact that the door was open for this idea has brought nearly 3 years of misery for the 30 residents who are suffering daily at the hands of Joe Peters:



He represents wealthy Newport Beach developer Mark E. Hyatt - MEH Pioneer, LLC. This developer, based in the rapidly dwindling Republican stronghold of Orange County has taken a page right out of the Trump playbook on how to exploit real estate for profit at the expense of tenants. The ADU drew his attention in 2018 to buy 801 Corbett, add as many units as he could stuff it with: inside, underneath and around, and then flip it for what he desires - a massive profit.

Legislation that the Supervisors originally envisioned as allowing a "granny flat" to be constructed in unneeded garages and backyards is being exploited at 801 Corbett to try and gain approval to construct what amounts to an entirely new building in, under and around the existing one. Increasing 801 to a ridiculously unlivable density - ruining it forever. Some of the added units being ludicrously tiny and not even designated as affordable. Everything's at market rate because this project is all about greed and profit: add to the unit count and flip the building so a wealthy Newport Beach developer can get even wealthier. The developer's wife (yes, Honeybee is her real name) is profiled flaunting their wealth:



The removal of badly needed parking, storage rooms and burdening the same 2 laundry washers with as many as 16 more people on top of the 30 existing residents is outrageous. Quality of life is seriously degraded for the residents and the neighborhood suffers a horrendous parking and traffic nightmare. With the Rooftop School directly across the street, the project puts the very young students in harm's way from construction and traffic:



The proposed ADU at 801 Corbett will effectively put as many as 34 more vehicles on the street, forcing them to remain dependent on gasoline because there isn't a parking garage with EV chargers available as the residents want:



The residents of 801 Corbett are already suffering greatly because of the out of control ADU. The developer's agent Joe Peters, who is pushing the ADU has been refusing to rent needed parking spaces to residents, refused to let them use the storeroom and in a truly despicable act, deliberately removed the garage alarm system resulting in our cars being repeatedly burglarized:

San Francisco Police Department
 REPORTEE FOLLOW-UP
 CAD: 172-920-368
 Case Number: 170-854-490
 Case numbers are assigned to an investigator based on facts obtained during the initial investigation.

<input type="checkbox"/> Company A (Central)	315-2400
<input type="checkbox"/> Company B (Southern)	575-6000
<input type="checkbox"/> Company C (Bayview)	671-2300
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Company D (Mission)	558-5400

Peters is trying to manipulate our situation here so he can falsely claim that the garage is "hardly being used", when in reality we are being denied parking and storage. Further, our safety and property in the garage have been knowingly put at risk in an effort to drive us out of the garage. He has been doing this systematically for months now leading up to his filing for the ADU. If that isn't bad enough, he lied to us and tried to keep his ADU plans a secret for months and has deliberately interfered with Planning's review process by aggressively removing all notices and even letters informing the residents about the ADU including the Environmental Review and Discretionary Review (the resident manager admitted that he was ordered to remove all ADU notices or he would be fired):



Residents opposed to his ADU have been repeatedly threatened with eviction and he's shown up late at night harassing them at their doorsteps with frightened residents calling the SFPD for help. He's even tried to intimidate residents by taking pictures or recording video. This harassment has been relentless, he does it every time he is on the property. He always does it making sure he's noticed in order to intimidate, then he sends printouts letting us know he is "watching". His henchmen are doing the same. It has gotten so bad that it has drawn the attention of the District Attorney's Office and on their instruction the police were called and they took a report:



This is the absurdity that Wiener's ADU has spawned.

Supervisors, please act quickly to pass Mandelman's ADU reforms.

Planning Commissioners, 30 of us here at 801 Corbett pray you will **stop this abuse by rejecting Joe Peter's overreaching ADU** (2021-000997DRP). We have suffered enough battling him for 3 years now, we cannot survive 3 additional years of horrendous demolition, excavation and construction turmoil only to be left with our building turned into an overcrowded and dysfunctional tenement. All of this is especially harmful to the many of us Senior Citizens with disabilities who have called 801 home for decades.

Sincerely,

Roger Dawson
On Behalf of the Tenants
801 Corbett, # 15
San Francisco, CA 94131
Cell: (650) 218-5431



This email has been checked for viruses by AVG antivirus software.
www.avg.com

BOARD of SUPERVISORS



City Hall
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689
Tel. No. (415) 554-5184
Fax No. (415) 554-5163
TDD/TTY No. (415) 554-5227

October 12, 2021

File No. 210699-2

Lisa Gibson
Environmental Review Officer
Planning Department
49 South Van Ness Avenue, Suite 1400
San Francisco, CA 94103

Dear Ms. Gibson:

On October 5, 2021, Supervisor Mandelman submitted the following substitute legislation:

File No. 210699-2

Ordinance amending the Planning Code to clarify the requirements for applications to construct Accessory Dwelling Units under the City's local Accessory Dwelling Unit approval process; amending the Administrative Code to clarify that landlords may not remove certain tenant housing services without just cause and that issuance of a building permit does not constitute just cause; making findings as required by the Tenant Protection Act of 2019; affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act; and making findings of consistency with the General Plan, and the eight priority policies of Planning Code, Section 101.1.

This legislation is being transmitted to you for environmental review.

Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Erica Major".

By: Erica Major, Assistant Clerk
Land Use and Transportation Committee

Attachment

c: Joy Navarrete, Environmental Planning
Don Lewis, Environmental Planning

BOARD of SUPERVISORS



City Hall
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689
Tel. No. (415) 554-5184
Fax No. (415) 554-5163
TDD/TTY No. (415) 554-5227

October 12, 2021

Planning Commission
Attn: Jonas Ionin
49 South Van Ness Avenue, Suite 1400
San Francisco, CA 94103

Dear Commissioners:

On October 5, 2021, Supervisor Mandelman introduced the following legislation:

File No. 210699-2

Ordinance amending the Planning Code to clarify the requirements for applications to construct Accessory Dwelling Units under the City's local Accessory Dwelling Unit approval process; amending the Administrative Code to clarify that landlords may not remove certain tenant housing services without just cause and that issuance of a building permit does not constitute just cause; making findings as required by the Tenant Protection Act of 2019; affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act; and making findings of consistency with the General Plan, and the eight priority policies of Planning Code, Section 101.1.

The proposed ordinance is being transmitted for review. The ordinance is pending before the Land Use and Transportation Committee and will be scheduled for hearing upon receipt of your response.

Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Erica Major".

By: Erica Major, Assistant Clerk
Land Use and Transportation Committee

c: Rich Hillis, Director
Scott Sanchez, Deputy Zoning Administrator
Corey Teague, Zoning Administrator
Lisa Gibson, Environmental Review Officer
Devyani Jain, Deputy Environmental Review Officer
Adam Varat, Acting Director of Citywide Planning
AnMarie Rodgers, Legislative Affairs
Dan Sider, Director of Executive Programs
Aaron Starr, Manager of Legislative Affairs
Joy Navarrete, Environmental Planning

BOARD of SUPERVISORS



City Hall
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689
Tel. No. (415) 554-5184
Fax No. (415) 554-5163
TDD/TTY No. (415) 554-5227

MEMORANDUM

TO: Robert Collins, Executive Director, Rent Board

FROM: Erica Major, Assistant Clerk, Land Use and Transportation Committee

DATE: October 12, 2021

SUBJECT: SUBSTITUTE LEGISLATION INTRODUCED

The Board of Supervisors' Land Use and Transportation Committee has received the following proposed legislation, introduced by Supervisor Mandelman on October 5, 2021:

File No. 210699-2

Ordinance amending the Planning Code to clarify the requirements for applications to construct Accessory Dwelling Units under the City's local Accessory Dwelling Unit approval process; amending the Administrative Code to clarify that landlords may not remove certain tenant housing services without just cause and that issuance of a building permit does not constitute just cause; making findings as required by the Tenant Protection Act of 2019; affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act; and making findings of consistency with the General Plan, and the eight priority policies of Planning Code, Section 101.1.

If you have comments or reports to be included with the file, please forward them to me at the Board of Supervisors, City Hall, Room 244, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, San Francisco, CA 94102 or by email at: erica.major@sfgov.org.

BOARD of SUPERVISORS



City Hall
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco 94102-4689
Tel. No. (415) 554-5184
Fax No. (415) 554-5163
TDD/TTY No. (415) 554-5227

MEMORANDUM

TO: Robert Collins, Executive Director, Rent Board

FROM: Erica Major, Assistant Clerk, Land Use and Transportation Committee

DATE: June 22, 2021

SUBJECT: LEGISLATION INTRODUCED

The Board of Supervisors' Land Use and Transportation Committee has received the following proposed legislation, introduced by Supervisor Mandelman on June 15, 2021:

File No. 210699

Ordinance amending the Planning Code to clarify the requirements for applications to construct Accessory Dwelling Units under the City's local Accessory Dwelling Unit approval process; amending the Administrative Code to clarify that landlords may not remove tenant housing services without just cause and that issuance of a building permit does not constitute just cause; making findings as required by the Tenant Protection Act of 2019; affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act; and making findings of consistency with the General Plan, and the eight priority policies of Planning Code, Section 101.1.

If you have comments or reports to be included with the file, please forward them to me at the Board of Supervisors, City Hall, Room 244, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, San Francisco, CA 94102 or by email at: erica.major@sfgov.org.

BOARD of SUPERVISORS



City Hall
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco 94102-4689
Tel. No. (415) 554-5184
Fax No. (415) 554-5163
TDD/TTY No. (415) 554-5227

June 22, 2021

Planning Commission
Attn: Jonas Ionin
49 South Van Ness Avenue, Suite 1400
San Francisco, CA 94103

Dear Commissioners:

On June 15, 2021, Supervisor Mandelman introduced the following legislation:

File No. 210699

Ordinance amending the Planning Code to clarify the requirements for applications to construct Accessory Dwelling Units under the City's local Accessory Dwelling Unit approval process; amending the Administrative Code to clarify that landlords may not remove tenant housing services without just cause and that issuance of a building permit does not constitute just cause; making findings as required by the Tenant Protection Act of 2019; affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act; and making findings of consistency with the General Plan, and the eight priority policies of Planning Code, Section 101.1.

The proposed ordinance is being transmitted for review. The ordinance is pending before the Land Use and Transportation Committee and will be scheduled for hearing upon receipt of your response.

Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Erica Major".

By: Erica Major, Assistant Clerk
Land Use and Transportation Committee

c: Rich Hillis, Director
Scott Sanchez, Deputy Zoning Administrator
Corey Teague, Zoning Administrator
Lisa Gibson, Environmental Review Officer
Devyani Jain, Deputy Environmental Review Officer
Adam Varat, Acting Director of Citywide Planning
AnMarie Rodgers, Legislative Affairs
Dan Sider, Director of Executive Programs
Aaron Starr, Manager of Legislative Affairs
Joy Navarrete, Environmental Planning

BOARD of SUPERVISORS



City Hall
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco 94102-4689
Tel. No. (415) 554-5184
Fax No. (415) 554-5163
TDD/TTY No. (415) 554-5227

June 22, 2021

File No. 210699

Lisa Gibson
Environmental Review Officer
Planning Department
49 South Van Ness Avenue, Suite 1400
San Francisco, CA 94103

Dear Ms. Gibson:

On June 15, 2021, Supervisor Mandelman submitted the following legislation:

File No. 210699

Ordinance amending the Planning Code to clarify the requirements for applications to construct Accessory Dwelling Units under the City's local Accessory Dwelling Unit approval process; amending the Administrative Code to clarify that landlords may not remove tenant housing services without just cause and that issuance of a building permit does not constitute just cause; making findings as required by the Tenant Protection Act of 2019; affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act; and making findings of consistency with the General Plan, and the eight priority policies of Planning Code, Section 101.1.

This legislation is being transmitted to you for environmental review.

Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Erica Major".

By: Erica Major, Assistant Clerk
Land Use and Transportation Committee

Attachment

c: Joy Navarrete, Environmental Planning
Don Lewis, Environmental Planning

Introduction Form

By a Member of the Board of Supervisors or Mayor

Time stamp
or meeting date

I hereby submit the following item for introduction (select only one):

- 1. For reference to Committee. (An Ordinance, Resolution, Motion or Charter Amendment).
- 2. Request for next printed agenda Without Reference to Committee.
- 3. Request for hearing on a subject matter at Committee.
- 4. Request for letter beginning : "Supervisor inquiries"
- 5. City Attorney Request.
- 6. Call File No. from Committee.
- 7. Budget Analyst request (attached written motion).
- 8. Substitute Legislation File No.
- 9. Reactivate File No.
- 10. Topic submitted for Mayoral Appearance before the BOS on

Please check the appropriate boxes. The proposed legislation should be forwarded to the following:

- Small Business Commission
- Youth Commission
- Ethics Commission
- Planning Commission
- Building Inspection Commission

Note: For the Imperative Agenda (a resolution not on the printed agenda), use the Imperative Form.

Sponsor(s):

Subject:

The text is listed:

Signature of Sponsoring Supervisor:

For Clerk's Use Only