



## GENERAL PLAN REFERRAL

September 23, 2025

**Case No.:** 2024-009355GPR  
**Address:** 344 Precita Ave. San Francisco, CA 94110; 3182 24<sup>th</sup> St. San Francisco, CA 94110; 3329 20<sup>th</sup> St. San Francisco, CA 94110; 35 Fair Ave. San Francisco, CA 94110; 3353 26<sup>th</sup> Street San Francisco, CA 94110; 3800 Mission St. San Francisco, CA 94110; 1015 Shotwell St. San Francisco, CA 94110; 2217 Mission St. San Francisco, CA 94110; 1500 Cortland St. San Francisco, CA 94110; 269 Richland Ave. San Francisco, CA 94110; 19 Precita Ave. San Francisco, CA 94110; 63 Lapidge St. San Francisco, CA 94110; 642 Guerrero St. San Francisco, CA 94110; 3840 Folsom St. San Francisco, CA 94110; 380 San Jose Avenue, San Francisco 94110

**Block/Lot Nos.:** 5524-001, 3641-023, 3611-060, 5609-007, 6570-001, 6692-001, 6520-031, 3590-033, 5690-044, 5720-010, 5501-043, 3588-022, 3587-078, 5683-005, 6532-034

**Project Sponsor:** Mayor's Office of Housing & Community Development  
**Applicant:** Daniel Cruz  
Mission Economic Development Agency (MEDA)  
(415) 237-3380  
[ldcruz@medasf.org](mailto:ldcruz@medasf.org)  
2301 Mission Street Suite 301  
San Francisco, CA 94110

**Staff Contact:** David H. Garcia – (628) 652 7433  
[david.h.garcia@sfgov.org](mailto:david.h.garcia@sfgov.org)

**Recommended By:**   
Joshua Switzky, Deputy Director of Citywide Policy for  
Sarah Dennis Phillips, Director of Planning

**Finding:** The project, on balance, is **in conformity** with the General Plan.

Please note that a General Plan Referral is a determination regarding the project's consistency with the Eight Priority Policies of Planning Code Section 101.1 and conformity with the Objectives and Policies of the General Plan. This General Plan Referral is not a permit to commence any work or change occupancy. Permits from appropriate Departments must be secured before work is started or occupancy is changed.

## Project Description

The Project will fund the refinancing and rehabilitation of 15 properties currently owned and operated by Mission Economic Development Agency (MEDA), which include approximately 89 residential and 9 commercial units throughout the Mission District. This refinancing will preserve affordability for all 89 units, supporting residents, small businesses, and non-profits for the next 40 years+, with allocated funds for essential repairs and improvements. Through MOHCD's Housing Preservation Program (HPP), the Project will ensure long-term affordability, providing stable housing and commercial space

Of the 89 residential units, 78 are currently occupied by tenants. All 9 commercial units are currently occupied, with 7 leased to small businesses and 2 to non-profits. The Project aims to support these local enterprises by upholding SF MOHCD standards and regulations in its ownership and management of the buildings. These ground-floor retail spaces feature a range of businesses, including entertainment, retail, food, and beauty services and non-profits including Precita Eyes Muralists Studio and Homies Organizing the Mission to Empower Youth (HOMEY). Through refinancing, MEDA will sustain its ownership and provide long-term stability for these commercial tenants.

The proposed upgrades include enhancements to building exteriors, interiors, electrical systems, plumbing, site access, and security, without significant changes to the units or surrounding areas. These improvements focus on essential life and safety needs, with no seismic retrofitting or major facade work required. On-site parking at some buildings will remain unchanged, ensuring no impact on commuter experience. This Project primarily represents a financial restructuring, with no substantial exterior modifications expected to affect nearby areas or uses.

## Environmental Review

The Project is 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.

## General Plan Compliance and Basis for Recommendation

As described below, the proposed Project is consistent with the Eight Priority Policies of Planning Code Section 101.1 and is, on balance, in conformity with the General Plan.

Note: General Plan Objectives are shown in **BOLD UPPER CASE** font; Policies are in **Bold** font; staff comments are in *italic* font.

### HOUSING ELEMENT

#### OBJECTIVE 1.A

#### **ENSURE HOUSING STABILITY AND HEALTHY HOMES.**

##### Policy 39

Support the repair and rehabilitation of housing to ensure life safety, health, and well-being of residents, especially in Environmental Justice Communities, and to support sustainable building practices.

*The Project would finance the repair and rehabilitation of existing affordable housing in the Mission District, an Environmental Justice Community.*

## MISSION AREA PLAN

### OBJECTIVE 2.2

#### **RETAIN AND IMPROVE EXISTING HOUSING AFFORDABLE TO PEOPLE OF ALL INCOMES.**

##### Policy 2.2.2

Preserve viability of existing rental units.

*The Project would finance the repair and rehabilitation of existing rental housing. Across all 15 buildings, units are serving extremely Low Income households, very low Income households, and low Income households.*

#### **Planning Code Section 101 Findings**

Planning Code Section 101.1 establishes Eight Priority Policies and requires review of discretionary approvals and permits for consistency with said policies. The Project is found to be consistent with the Eight Priority Policies as set forth in Planning Code Section 101.1 for the following reasons:

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 Project would continue to support existing neighborhood-serving retail uses and future opportunities for resident employment in and ownership of such businesses.*

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

*The Project would conserve and protect existing housing and would preserve neighborhood diversity by preserving affordable housing.*

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

*The Project would help preserve and enhance the City's supply of affordable housing.*

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

*The Project would have no effect on commuter traffic, MUNI transit service, 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 Project would have no effect on the City’s industrial or service sectors or on future opportunities for resident employment or ownership in these sectors.*

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

*The Project would rehabilitate existing housing and would thus enhance the City’s preparedness to protect against injury and loss of life in an earthquake.*

- 7. That the landmarks and historic buildings be preserved;

*The Project would have no effect on landmarks and historic buildings.*

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

*The Project would have no effect on the City’s parks and open space and their access to sunlight and vistas.*

<b>Finding:</b>	The project, on balance, is <b>in conformity</b> with the General Plan.
-----------------	---